



Modern Militiaman



A Journal of the Modern Resistance Movement

Issue #5, April 19, 1997 -- Commemorative Issue

Purpose and Dedication: This electronic and limited print newsletter is dedicated to the modern militiamen and women of the American Resistance Movement. The writers, editors, and contributors of this newsletter have by their talents become leading actors within the overall Patriot movement, be they militiamen, common-law jurists, tax-protesters, Freeman, shortwave talk-show hosts, Libertarians, Conspiracy Theorists or other assorted Rebels with a cause. We are an unruly bunch.

Most of the feeds and articles to this newsletter come off the Internet or electronic mail, which is the Gutenberg device of choice. Far-flung, quick, cheap, and secure, the Internet is a growing web of information which cannot be stopped or effectively censored. While at least one copy of each issue will be printed in order to take advantage of 1st Amendment press protections, thus blanketing the electronic edition, this and every issue is designed to be pulled apart and redesigned for every region, for every portion of the former Sweet Land of Liberty, to be used by Patriots everywhere. The opinions expressed in this newsletter are the opinions only of the authors, nobody else. The result should be freedom, not peace.

This is the fifth issue. This issue will be dedicated to looking at our past, and to planning for our future.

Managing Editor [Martin Lindstedt](mailto:mlindste@clandjop.com) (mlindste@clandjop.com)

Copyright 1997. Anyone is at liberty to copy this newsletter in whole or in part for non-profit purposes provided they properly attribute copied portions to *Modern Militiaman* and the author(s). People who do make a buck from it are expected to pony up.

Table of Contents:

- [1. About This Issue](#) by Martin Lindstedt, Managing Editor
- [2. State of the Militia, April 19, 1997](#) -- by Martin Lindstedt
- [3. What has the Militia Ever Done For Me?](#) -- by Norman Olson
- [4. Modern Militias](#) -- by Mike Johnson
- [5. Last Kings, Chapter 1](#) -- by Martin Lindstedt

[6. Crime Pays](#) -- by Kurt Saxon

[7. Selected Columns of Vin Suprynowicz](#)

[8. Patriot Riddle](#) -- by Martin Lindstedt

[9. A Fundraising Letter for a Oklahoma City Grand Jury](#) -- by State Representative Charles Keys

[10. Dangerous Liasons](#) -- by Martin Lindstedt

[11. Return Fire -- Letters to the Editor](#)

About This Issue:

The purpose of Issue #5 is to briefly look at our past and to prepare our Resistance organizations to win the Great Revolution, presently in its initial stages, but well past the point of no return. The social order has broken down. Since there is no justice there can be no peace until either our side or the predator and parasite side is exterminated to the last combatant. Anything less than this is delusional wishfulness, which has no place in this magazine. The time has come to either prepare yourself to kill our enemies or to be enslaved by the New World Order or any other gang of looters coming down the pike.

The first article is "The State of the Militia, April 19, 1997," by myself. The modern militiaman is someone who is squared away and quietly working for the day to re-establish civilization upon the ruins of the present decayed democracy. He is not an egotist, sitting at the computer keyboard, trying to make a name for himself. Rather, he is within an underground cell of from 3-5 fellow combatants, maintaining loose anonymous communication with those people who cannot go underground.

Such a militiaman is a steady, confident individual. He has provided for the people who must depend upon him for survival. Having made provision for his dependents, he is in a position to serve others. Being a modern militiaman is a call to service, to God, family, and country. Having unknown quantities of such men and women ensures that the Resistance will eventually prevail. So what is "The State of the Militia" today? Excellent, but always to be improved.

With a slightly different analysis of our present and an appreciation of our past, Commander Norman Olson reminds us all of "What has the Militia Ever Done For Me?" Commander Olson has been there and done that. The Michigan Militia was founded in April 1994, three years ago, along with such famous militias such as the Militia of Montana and the Gadsden Minutemen. The month of April, Nineteenth day has always been pivotal for American Patriots -- 222 years ago and today.

Mike Johnson, who formerly ran the best e-mail list, has weighed in with his opinion of what a "Modern Militia" should be. For those of you who still need "Constitutional Blessing" before destroying your enemies who ignore that particular scrap of paper in the rush to enslave others, this is a very good read. Mike is an original thinker and back when he wrote this article, which is still in the mainstream of militia philosophy, even I would not have dared to disagree with it.

This article is included because it is a pap to help wean the Thomas Jefferson wanna-bes without going cold turkey and because I wish to provoke Mike, along with Patricia Neil, into being the Roving Editor for MM#6. Then him and I can tussle -- or not.

What passes for humor is next included when I recount a minor incident that took place between the prophet Elijah and the po-leece roundabouts April 19, 776 B.C. Since all we are left is an Appeal to Heaven for justice, this story shows an appeal or two which worked. With God as a juror, things worked out so satisfactorily that Elijah didn't have to file the equivalent of a Title 42 § 1983 before one of the King's Baal courts.

Kurt Saxon, a bona-fide character, shows how "Crime Pays" between an unholy alliance of criminals at the top and of the bottom preying upon the cowardly middle of a decaying social order. Kurt Saxon, who espouses and coined the term 'survivalist' preaches a secular gospel -- evil will cannibalize itself, but not before taking a bunch of idiots down with it.

Go to his WWW page at: <http://www.KURTSAXON.COM/cary> and buy some books which will tell you how to survive the days ahead by providing for and protecting yourself and your loved ones.

Upon the heels of Mr. Saxons' revelations of the origin and end of the Amerikkkan Police State, I go on to show that state evil is not new nor is the necessity to destroy it by posing a "Patriot Riddle." Future issues of MM will pose such brain teasers and moral questions. The reward for thinking seditiously will be the first printed issue of this most seditious rag. Perhaps it will become a collector's item after our side wins. Like the touch of natural royalty, it might even cure moral scrofula.

State Representative Charles Keys needs money to impanel an Oklahoma County Grand Jury to probe what really went on two years ago. That is why he wrote a fund raising letter. He wants to find out who is responsible. He wants to punish John Doe #2, #3, #4, . . . #5,436. Of course we know who is the real John Doe #2 (also known as The Great Unindictable Co-Conspirator) that bombed the Federal Building. (Not counting Manchurian Candidates and Oswalds.) After all, it is THEIR building and THEIR human chattel. Render unto Caesar, that what is Caesar's for target practice. Just keep us out of it.

The last major article will be the aptly named "Dangerous Liasons," wherein I make a case for the recognition of reality. It is time that we recognize -- and influence -- our natural allies and source of shock troops in the Christian Identity, White/Black Nationalist and Neo-Nazi movements.

I am not asking anyone to love these people or their ideals. Just as we must understand our Enemy, the better to destroy them, so we must understand our allies and the enemies of our Enemy. If we fail to do so, our Enemy will divide and rule over us, like he has been doing for time immemorial.

I know full well that a number of militia mediocrities will piss and moan over the politically incorrect promulgation of such policies. Screw 'em. There is no longer time to waste waiting for them to grow a set of nuts.

Lastly, loose ends to tie up:

There will be some Letters to the Editor published. If you want to be published, fight with the Managing Editor. The Managing Editor loves to fight.

This is to announce that Modern Militiaman's Electronic Gazette, a weekly e-zine devoted to militia matters will be published starting April 19, 1997. Rumors, newspaper articles, conspiracy theories will be the primary things displayed therein, although from time to time this Editor will grace the Gazette's electronic pages in order to set the militia movement aright. E-mail bandwidth shall not be wasted on posting to non-subscribers. Most of you will have to get it off of the appropriate WWW page(s).

--[Martin Lindstedt](#), Managing Editor

.

.

.

The State of the Militia, April 19, 1997

So what is the state of the Militia Movement this 19th April, 1997, four years after Waco, three years after the first militia units were formed, and two years after the Oklahoma City bombing? All of us militiamen know our past, but in what condition are we in now, and what will be our future? Let me make a few observations, then I will stick out my neck and make a few predictions.

Our Past. This movement was conceived at Ruby Ridge in 1992, given birth on April 19, 1993 at Waco, and grew up suddenly on April 19, 1995 when we were blamed for an act of murderous terrorism we did not commit at Oklahoma City. We have been hammered hard, but have learned from our mistakes due to the sedition and conspiracy trials of 1996. While many of the open militias have degenerated into groups of "militia generals" commanding "units" of 4-5 lesser officers, yammering about the need to "restore" a piece of paper called "The Constitution," in the meantime modern militia units have, like icebergs, reacted to the heat by shielding well over nine-tenths of their bulk under the waterline.

As time goes on, our people, us patriots, will cease looking back to a past increasingly grown distant -- gone with the wind of change. Instead, we now grow the flexible communications network to connect by unseen links our cellular structure, as we learn self-government through flexible consensus. Meanwhile, hidden openly in plain sight, our political groups are forming, ready to subvert to our own ends the political parties, having overthrown and burnt away the deadwood. We use through inaction even our derided "militia generals" to broadcast disinformation and random noise while we pursue our goals, as we try to decide what new form of government we shall implement after we bury the current corrupt world order.

The agents provocateur of the corrupt regime succeeded only in catching and imprisoning the congenitally stupid and loudmouthed. No longer are militiamen so stupid as to hold meetings and allow criminals under a informant quota system talk about making bombs to use against the NWO/ZOG. Make bombs or not, the time for talking such foolishness is in the past. It is now understood by even the most stupid militiaman that any wannabe mad bombers are fedgoons, planted by the government to perform acts of terror to attribute to our Cause.

Also unearthed for what they were are the "militia leaders" whose only apparent function was to criticize other "militia generals" for the way they ran their militia squads. Their petty egos revealed -- when put under stress -- absolutely nothing. Some of them quit in a huff and disappeared, never to be heard of again. Others went to the other side and now, thankfully, are poisoning their new co-workers with their bile and venom. A snake is a snake, regardless of which side they say they are on, and they will strike whomever is closest.

Our Present. Paradoxically, our lowest point so far occurred sometime in the past few months, sometime in December, January, or February. The Movement seemed to have gone dormant with the convictions of Robert Starr, McRaney and Spain. The First Criminal won re-election by a Moronic Majority of Amerikkants who wanted a sympathetic moral degenerate who "understood" them to rule over them. The misfits of the Viper "Militia" pled guilty rather than take their chances on a corrupt show trial. The Missouri Fifteen were found guilty in the corrupt state kangaroo-kourt system by a judas-jury of "tampering with a judicial officer by means of filing false liens" even though none of them had filed or signed any such lien. Some "militia leaders" quit -- or turned.

Perhaps, learning the wrong lesson from his colleague in Missouri, the Texas Attorney General will allow federal troops to invade the "Republic of Texas" and several of the old people too feeble to carry a gun and run around in the woods who make up the majority of the common-law court jurors will get killed. And, in large part, the "militia generals" will fail to show up with their squads to fight the next civil war, and other militia generals try to rationalize why there wasn't "No More Wacos!", even though there was. Perhaps then it will be thought that the militia movement is down -- and out.

Such an impression will be wrong. The low point of the American Revolution was at Valley Forge the winter of 1777-1778. So too was our Valley Forge of 1996-1997. The true revolutionists who always said, "As many Wacos as what it takes to get the point," will come to predominate. Our Goliad, our Alamo, our Waco, our Ft. Davis, will always be remembered -- and ultimately revenged in full to overflowing.

Our elderly patriots, having their naive efforts at "paper terrorism" rubbed in their faces by dying in prison, having suffered a world of HRT, will relearn the ways of war from their youth and apply it one last time against the gubbnmint gungoons of our New Nazis and New Communists. Freeman aged sixty, seventy will show how they fear not death as they apply the judicial lessons of rope and rifle against the lawyers' guild, bringing red justice to the State.

The stonewall of silence and complicity behind the murders in Waco and Oklahoma City is cracked. Internet WorldWideWeb pages and videocassette documentaries are communicating the truth to the uneasy majority. The Old Elites are becoming uneasy, like the Bourbons and Romanovs, figuring out that their massive creaky police state will not protect them from the wrath of the oppressed. Soon they will be trying to co-opt the New Elites, who, sensing the coming change, will refuse to buy pottage at any price. "You have neither heads nor oceans of your own blood enough to negate justice," shall be the confident reply. "We shall not serve, when we can rule ourselves." "Go to those you wronged, and accept their justice." "No justice, no peace."


Having received their declaration of war and having no other choice, the decayed elites will try to get their way using the mechanism of state power acting under color of "law." But the old shibboleths shall be measured and found wanting. For once good men have figured out that man-made laws are mere scraps of paper devised to do evil without fear of retaliation, evil men will recover their just reward from good men freed from their self-imposed artificial restraint. There will no longer be a blank check extended to do evil. The peace of slavery shall not fall upon the land. Evil shall be paid back in full and in kind.

Present events are shaping the future. The militia movement which survives and prospers will be the militias who know full well what they want and will do whatever it takes to get their goals accomplished. We can no longer go back to the past of the 1950's, 60's, 70's or 80's. Any such attempts will be as successful as stegosaurus, with his walnut-sized brain, trying to get back to his heyday in the Cretaceous period. How many stegosaurii do you see running around nowadays? "Change or die!" -- is the law of life. Any militia falsely founded upon a piece of paper over 200 years old, which all pay lip service to but nobody obeys called "The Constitution," deserves sacrifice to the State-god upon their false altar. Rather, it is to be understood that a steadfast application to the personal liberty of yourselves and your friends, while taking full advantage of any opportunities to defeat the enemy (gubbnmint, NWO, ZOG, city hall) is the hallmark of a successful Resistance organization.

So go out and form new underground cells, striving to improve the human quality of our organizations, while publicly forming open militias devoted to embarrassing the government's pretensions to legitimacy. Our movement is alive. But it is only quality elements which shall survive in the days ahead.

.
Our Future. Is glorious. We shall overcome -- someday.

We shall win the upcoming Great Revolution by default because we are the only ones who can make order out of the coming chaos. Most of the social predators and parasites shall die in the conflict wherein the mass of their human herd animals perished. Us surviving patriots shall destroy the remaining predators, because we must not let them live to feed upon us. Then to us shall fall the task of building up a new social order wherein power is always chained up by its triumvirate partners called accountability and responsibility.

.

.

From: [Norman Olson](#)
To: Martin Lindstedt
Subject: Re: Permission to reprint article.

Dear Commander Olson:

I came across this article attributed to you at the Patriot's Page on the Internet. I would like your permission to reprint it in my e-zine, Modern Militiaman #5.

I don't altogether agree with it, but it is valuable in a sense of where we have been, and a different view of the future. Also, as you are a founder of one of the charter militias of April 1994, I want the movement to look back with some pride as to where we have been, before we turn our faces to what we must do in the future.

MM#5 will be a politically incorrect issue, as I have a different view of the State of the Militia, and I believe the time has come to make allies of the Christian Identity and White/Black Nationalist movements to face the common foe -- the government.

If you give me your permission to reprint below article, it will be with the understanding that while MM#5 found your article of value, other than the text, our opinions are not necessarily the same.

Sincerely yours,

--Martin Lindstedt,
Managing Editor, Modern Militiaman

Martin, You may reprint the article (it needs some typos corrected).. In the one place where I refer to the "Constitutional Militia" that term is vague... It would better be: Modern Citizens Militia.

The disclaimer you suggested is a good idea.

Kind Regards,

[Norm Olson](#)

P.S. You may also print my e-mail address should others want to follow up.

What has the Militia Ever Done For Me?

Norm Olson, Commander

Northern Michigan Regional Militia

Once again I must rise in defense of the fledgling militia. I am not making excuses for what it has not done, because those who expect great things forget the tremendous cost involved... (My dear mother used to caution me to "be careful what you pray for, you may get it".) Quite frankly, I have tried to restrain the militia so that it wouldn't do something that history will never forgive...

-- Number 1 - We are not ready to fight a campaign... we are still unsure of our own motives for doing anything... With the death of many popular conspiracy theories (black helicopters, Gurkas massing along the borders, Soviet equipment on rail cars, cryptic stickers on road signs, Russian troops in salt mines, underground cities of 10s of thousands of soldiers, etc.) we find that involvement in a militia is rather pointless. Some still

stay active in the militia because they are visionary people who see the need for eternal vigilance. Others however have left because there are not enough things frightening enough to stay.

-- Number 2 - We all have our own particular idea of how to fix things. Some feel we ought to go on the offensive to destroy the threat before it attacks. Others still feel that politics and rhetoric are the way to go. Still others contend that defensive preparedness is best. There is not a concerted voice on what we should do at this time...

-- Number 3 - Instead of criticizing the militia for what it doesn't do, consider what the militia has done already.

With the emergence of the Constitutional militia in the Spring of 1994, the corrupt power brokers in Washington began to measure carefully their steps. Sure they thought we were middle-aged, overweight, wannabe's running through the woods, but ya know, those are the most dangerous kind of people... They don't fight like ordinary soldiers... They are unconventional, and we showed the world that there were enough of us to "take care of business" should the need come.

I firmly believe that had it not been for the visible and public show of strength, the guns, uniforms, etc., there might have been more Wacos... Anyone who knows me will tell you that I will openly and defiantly shake a gun in the face of any tyrant. Because of the gutsy and determined stand that the militia took during 1994, the feds had to rethink their options. We made them blink!

Remember that cold war is preferable to hot war if we can have it. The militia won a great victory in this regard. With the emergence of nearly a thousand militia organizations, and an effective, albeit simple, communication system, the militia put a credible force upon the plain. We stopped the feds dead in their tracks... The militia can take credit for that and only eternity will reveal how many terrible abuses of power we actually prevented by our public and open show of strength.

But allow me to view this thing objectively for a minute. The Waco incident was the last engagement of the government's war against the people before cold war. Since then we have had incidents, but they were situations that involved "Barnie Fife" law enforcement who did stupid things... The last confrontation of any significance was the Freeman Standoff in Montana last year. I am certain that the feds ruled out another Waco frenzy because of the militia. Without the militia's open and public stand and the avowed retaliation should the Freeman people be butchered, I dare say that the Freeman would be dead today.

Now, people can argue this way or that over what the militia is accomplishing now or will accomplish in the future. Let them argue. But from where I stand, looking back at what the Militia HAS accomplished will be written about in history books as one of the great acts of righteous defiance by the people of this land against the abuses of power of tyranny. When the tyrants attack, we will be there. History will hail the defender as the champion ... so it must be.

Make no mistake about the resolve of the militia: it is still alive and well. But it will take a Lexington, or another Waco to bring us out for we are enduring, patient, and resilient. We, like our Forefathers before us will suffer many wrongs and we will find that many of them are sufferable.. But while we endure, we prepare for what must come. We will wait, ... and when we rise, the earth will quake beneath our tread...

.

.

This issue can be found at:

Lindstedt's Linkages:

- [Patrick Henry On-Line](#)

- [The Patriot Coalition](#)

.

Modern Militias

This essay is an attempt to go into some of the basics behind the modern militia movement. It will deal with the philosophical, ethical and moral considerations underlying the militia movement. It will also deal with some of the similarities and differences between modern militia units and professional military units.

Those who have already done some studying of the concept of militias comprised of the whole body of the people realize that it has a history that dates back at least as far as the Anglo-Saxons who inhabited England over a thousand years ago. It is not the purpose of this essay to delve that far back into time to discuss the origins of the militia. Rather the time and place that will be used for most of our references will be in America, just shortly before, during and after the Revolutionary War.

The first thing that we will look at for the basis of the militia is the Declaration of Independence. The Declaration was not instrumental in the formation of the militias that fought against the British Crown. In fact, the Revolutionary War had begun approximately 1 year and 3 months before the Declaration was written. However, the Declaration does a beautiful job of summing up just what it was that the militias were fighting for, and discussing the philosophical and moral basis for their existence. The following quotation is taken from the second paragraph of the Declaration of Independence:

"WE hold these Truths to be self-evident, that all Men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the Pursuit of Happiness -- That to secure these Rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just Powers from the Consent of the Governed, that whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive of these Ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new Government, laying its Foundation on such Principles, and organizing its Powers in such Form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their Safety and Happiness. Prudence, indeed, will dictate that Governments long established should not be changed for light and transient Causes; and accordingly all Experience hath shewn, that Mankind are more disposed to suffer, while Evils are sufferable, than to right themselves by abolishing the Forms to which they are accustomed. But when a long Train of Abuses and Usurpations, pursuing invariably the same Object, evinces a Design to reduce them under absolute Despotism, it is their Right, it is their Duty, to throw off such Government, and to provide new Guards for their future Security." (1)

Thus, as explained by the Declaration of Independence, it is the body of the people as a whole that determines the legitimacy of a given government. To the extent that the government governs with the consent of the people and does not abridge or usurp their rights, then the government is legitimate. However, if the government abridges the rights of the people, abuses them, governs without their consent, and in general reduces them to slavery and debt servitude, then the people may abolish their government.

In practice, however, the abolition of a despotic government is much easier said than done. This is the main reason that there are so many of them in existence today. The only method for abolishing a genuinely despotic government that has proven to work even part of the time is to take up arms against it. The various different methods that people have developed for civil disobedience are all very well, but if the government decides that it would just as soon execute all who oppose it then they will be of limited utility. One has only has to look at the example afforded by the millions who perished under Adolf Hitler, Joseph Stalin and Mao Tse Tung in this century to see the truth of that.

While the Founding Fathers were unfamiliar with the more recent examples of despotism and tyranny, they were well acquainted with the history of the Greek and Roman civilizations. Also, many of them belonged to groups that had come to America in the first place to escape persecution at the hands of government officials. It was their intention to ensure that despotic and tyrannical governments would not come to have power either over them or their descendants. Indeed, as voiced in the Declaration, they felt that an absolute duty existed to rebel against a tyrannical and oppressive government.

Now, in order for a people to successfully rebel against a government that has become tyrannical, they need to have weapons and they need to have units which can put those weapons to use. Isolated individual actions have proven time and time again to have limited utility in forcing governments to do things that they do not want to do. The people with the weapons must be able to coordinate the use of those weapons, and thus the ability to form militia units is as vital to the ability of a people to protect itself from tyrannical government as the ability to possess weapons is.

It should go without saying that as the purpose of the militia is to ride herd over the government and provide the final check on its use of power that it would be counterproductive to give the government total control over the militia. If one studies the Constitution which was adopted after the Revolutionary War, the Bill of Rights, and the arguments put forward by Alexander Hamilton in the Federalist Papers for the adoption of the Constitution, it can be shown that the national level government was never intended to have total control over the militia.

In order to make this more clear we shall first look at what the Constitution itself has to say on the matter. The first quotation we will examine is taken from the enumerated powers of Congress found in Article I section 8 of the Constitution.

...To declare War, grant letters of Marque and Reprisal, and make Rules concerning Captures on Land and Water;
To raise and support Armies, but no appropriation of Money to that Use shall be for a longer Term than two years;
To provide and maintain a Navy;
To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces;
To provide for calling forth the Militia to execute the Laws of the Union, suppress Insurrections and repel Invasions;
To provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining, the Militia, and for governing such Part of them as may be employed in the Service of the United States, reserving to the States respectively, the Appointment of the Officers, and the authority of training the Militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress; ... (2)

Thus we can see by examining the enumerated powers of Congress that the national level government was never intended to have total control over the militia. The State level governments were to have the most direct control over the militia, and the national level government was only responsible for setting forth such ground rules as would be needed to enable all the State militias to integrate together effectively. Thus, Congress only calls forth the militia for three very specific purposes, it does not create the militia. The Congress only has the authority to govern that part of the militia which has actually been called into the service of the United States.

This issue has also been somewhat clouded in modern times by the wording that the Founding Fathers chose when they adopted the Second Amendment to the Constitution. The Second Amendment states, "A well regulated Militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed." (3) Many people are in doubt as to what exactly the Founding Fathers referred to when they were talking about a "well regulated militia", and what relationship this had to the people's right to keep and bear arms. However, a quick reading of what Alexander Hamilton had to say in the Federalist, number 29 is most enlightening as to what was meant.

The project of disciplining all the militia of the United States is as futile as it would be injurious if it were capable of being carried into execution. A tolerable expertness in military movements is a business that requires time and practice. It is not a day, nor a week nor even a month, that will suffice for the attainment of it.

To oblige the great body of the yeomanry and of the other classes of the citizens to be under arms for the purpose of going through military exercises and evolutions, as often as might be necessary to acquire the degree of perfection which would entitle them to the character of a well-regulated militia, would be a real grievance to the people and a serious public inconvenience and loss. It would form an annual deduction from the productive labor of the country to an amount which,

calculating upon the present numbers of the people, would not fall far short of a million pounds. To attempt a thing which would abridge the mass of labor and industry to so considerable an extent would be unwise: and the experiment, if made, could not succeed, because it would not be long endured. Little more can reasonably be aimed at with respect to the people at large than to have them properly armed and equipped; and in order that this be not neglected, it will be necessary to assemble them once or twice in the course of a year. (4)

Thus, we see in the wording used by Alexander Hamilton, indicating the usage of the Founding Fathers at that time, a "well-regulated militia" was a militia unit that could execute standard tactical drills with a high degree of proficiency. This was differentiated from the term "militia" which from the context was obviously the entire body of the people. It was felt that the "militia" or the entire body of the people, could not be trained to the level that they could all be described as "well-regulated militia" because it would be too time consuming a task. Thus, what does one do when one can not have the entire body of people trained well enough to execute the standard tactical drills that would be required of a line infantry unit? The answer is that one at least ensures that they have all the weapons and equipment that they will need. Thus, the Second Amendment to the Constitution, interpreted in light of what Hamilton had to say, guarantees to the entire body of the people the right to keep and bear arms, because the formation of the "well-regulated Militia" that is "necessary to the security of a Free State", is based on having the entire body of the people armed and equipped with the prerequisites they need to function as members of a line unit.

Alexander Hamilton then goes on to say the following in the paragraph that immediately follows the one I quoted previously from the Federalist number 29:

But though the scheme of disciplining the whole nation must be abandoned as mischievous or impracticable; yet it is a matter of the utmost importance that a well-digested plan should, as soon as possible, be adopted for the proper establishment of the militia. The attention of the government ought particularly to be directed to the formation of a select corps of moderate size, upon such principles as will really fit it for service in case of need. By thus circumscribing the plan, it will be possible to have a body of well-trained militia ready to take the field whenever the defense of the State shall require it. This will not only lessen the call for military establishments, but if circumstances should at any time oblige the government to form an army of any magnitude that army can never be formidable to the liberties of the people while there is a large body of citizens little if at all inferior to them in discipline and the use of arms, who stand ready to defend their own rights and those of their fellow-citizens.

This appears to me the only substitute that can be devised for a standing army, and the best possible security against it, if it should exist. (5)

Thus, we can see that Alexander Hamilton wanted the States to form select militias that would be well trained enough that they could take the field whenever the defense of the State required it. The national level government was discouraged from raising and maintaining armies, but could call up the select militia from the States for service in times of specific need. Thus, the lack of a national level standing army would not put the nation as a whole at risk, because each State would have ready forces under its direct control that it could use to respond to invasions, insurrections, etc.. And, should a problem arise that would require the resources of more than one State to deal with it, the national level government would coordinate things.

Also, we see that Hamilton intended that these select militias in the service of their respective States would be used to put down an army maintained by the national level government if such action became necessary in order to preserve the rights of the people. Given that these select militia were dependent on the ability of the people as a whole to keep and bear military quality arms, that right was guaranteed to the people as a whole under the Second Amendment to the Constitution. Also, the vast majority of State Constitutions also have clauses and passages guaranteeing the right of the people to keep and bear arms. This was to ensure that the fundamental prerequisites for keeping a tyrannical government in line, arms and people who could use them organized into units that could put those arms to use effectively, would always be outside the scope of the government's ability to legally negate their existence.

It is especially important to keep in mind as we think about what Hamilton had to say that he was one of the Founding Fathers who wanted to have a relatively strong central government. So, when you find one of the people who wanted a strong central government arguing that it was the State level governments and the people who were to have proportionately more force at their disposal than the national government, I feel that it is highly significant.

At any rate, we have now done some study about what the Founding Fathers intended the militia to be like. It will also be illustrative to see what they actually did immediately before and during the Revolutionary War.

As the size and repressive character of the standing army increased, many Americans began to arm and to organize themselves into independent militias. In 1774, George Mason and George Washington organized the Fairfax County Militia Association, which was not subject to the control of the royal governor and which in fact arose, in part, as a defense force against the regular militia.

"Threat'ned with the Destruction of our Civil-rights, & Liberty," (as stated in the resolution drafted by Mason), the members of this independent company of volunteers, who elected their own officers, pledged that "we will, each of us, constantly keep by us" a firelock, six pounds of gun powder, and twenty pounds of lead.

*In praising the Fairfax County model, a writer from Georgia implored that "the English troops in our front, and our governors forbid giving assent to militia laws, make it high time that we enter into *associations* for learning the use of arms, and to choose officers ..." [emphasis in original]*
(6)

Thus, we see that at least some of the Founding Fathers began by organizing militia units without any support at all from, in fact in opposition to, the "legitimate" government at the time. As the problems with Great Britain progressed, other areas of the country took other actions as their local customs dictated.

As Samuel Adams and his Massachusetts colleagues were meeting in Philadelphia, the colony's towns had elected delegates to a new Massachusetts Provincial Congress after the dissolution of the House by General Gage.

Convening in Salem, with Hancock as president, the delegates launched the colony's first government independent of the British king. They ordered money held back from the royal collections and channeled into their own accounts. They set up elite units within the militia-companies of fifty privates who were instructed to move at the shortest notice. And they established Committees of Safety to oversee those shock troops, who were calling themselves Minute Men. (7)

The good people of Charlotte, North Carolina, chose to arrange their affairs in a different manner. Among the resolutions that they adopted on May 31, 1775, were the following:

4. That the Inhabitants of this County do meet on a certain Day appointed by this Committee, and having formed themselves into nine Companies, to wit, eight for the County, and one for the Town of Charlotte, do choose a Colonel and other military Officers, who shall hold and exercise their several Powers by Virtue of this Choice, and independent of Great Britain, and former Constitution of this Province.

5. That for the better Preservation of the Peace, and Administration of Justice, each of these Companies do choose from their own Body two discreet Freeholders, who shall be empowered each by himself, and singly, to determine all Matters of Controversy arising within the said Company under the Sum of Twenty Shillings, and jointly and together all Controversies under the sum of Forty Shillings, yet so as their Decisions may admit of Appeals to the Convention of Select Men of the whole County; and also, that any one of these shall have power to examine, and commit to Confinement, Persons accused of Petit Larceny.

6. That those two Select Men, thus chosen, do, jointly and together, chose from the Body of their particular Company two persons, properly qualified to serve as Constables, who may assist them in the Execution of their Office.

7. That upon Complaint of any Person to either of these Select Men, he do issue his Warrant, directed to the Constable, commanding him to bring the Aggressor before him or them to answer the said Complaint.

8. That these eighteen Select Men, thus appointed, do meet every third Tuesday in January, April, July, and October, at the Court-house, in Charlotte, to hear and determine all Matters of Controversy for Sums exceeding Forty Shillings; also Appeals: And in Cases of Felony, to commit the Person or Persons convicted thereof to close Confinement, until the Provincial Congress shall provide and establish Laws and modes of Proceeding in all such Cases. (8)

Thus, we see that initially George Washington and George Mason formed a militia unit in opposition to the government of the colony of Virginia at that time, and also in opposition to the local militia forces controlled by that government. Later, up in New England, where there was a strong tradition of local government at town hall meetings, the people there set up new local governments and simultaneously created militia units that were responsible to those local governments. Later still, the people in Charlotte, North Carolina, pretty much set things up so that for all practical purposes it could be argued that the local militia **was** the local government. So, it can be seen that the Founding Fathers pretty much did what they felt they had to do in the specific instances to get good, viable militia units formed, and also to set up what local government they needed. In most cases, the militia units so formed had a political role which was much greater than that of their purely military counterparts that fought on the side of the British crown.

The British military units were merely the servants of the king who employed coercive force at his behest, and for whatever reasons seemed best to him. The militia units in many cases were able to wield significant power within their local governments by reason of the number of votes that they represented in their individual members at the town meetings, and or because of the way the provisional local governments had been constructed, giving those who would have to fight and die for what they were trying to create a level of control over things that a purely military unit would not have. This should not be taken to mean that the militia units had an absolute and total lock on the local government, far from it. But I am trying to point out that their role and their voice in the decisions that sent them into harms way were much greater than that enjoyed by a purely military unit. They had a much greater say over just what circumstances would require them to use coercive force and the situations in which they would try to bring it to bear.

In effect, I am saying that militia units play a political role because those ends which they desire to achieve are in the final analysis political ends. Our Founding Fathers did not form militia units in potential opposition to the British until they felt that the political system which they were under as British subjects had broken down to the extent that the British government was no longer their legitimate government. Their rights were no longer being protected against abuses and usurpations, their voices were not being heard, their legitimate needs were not being met, and their consent was no longer being obtained by the government for the actions that it took that effected them. Thus, under such circumstances, they felt that they had an absolute duty to rebel.

It is important to note that some of the most respected military theorists who have ever written on the subject of war see it as being intimately related to politics.

Thus, therefore, the political object, as the original motive of the War, will be the standard for determining both the aim of the military force and also the amount of effort to be made. (9)

The object in war is to attain a better peace-even if only from your own point of view. Hence it is essential to conduct war with constant regard to the peace you desire.(10)

The First Factor is MORAL POSITION. You must operate from such a strong sense of moral justification that even the threat of death will not deter you from your course.

You need such a firm sense of moral resolution to overcome the debilitating effects of the inevitable dangers, setbacks and hardships which will accompany any war.

For a nation to have this moral strength and resolution, the government must have the support of the people. The people must agree that the reasons for the war are necessary, just and deserving of the utmost sacrifice. Leaders who would wage war without this strong moral justification, and without the support of the people, will find their own power bases quickly crumbling when setbacks and hardships occur. (11)

So, given that an array of military theorists from Clausewitz to Liddell Hart to Sun Tzu are telling us in effect that one cannot divorce war from politics, I think that it is a very good idea to pay attention to what they have to say. Now, a professional military unit simply applies coercive force when and where its political leaders tell it to. However, in a true militia type unit, the military unit and its political leadership are effectively one and the same. Hence, it will be the unit that determines for what reasons that it fights and how hard, and at what cost to itself. So, to say that a militia unit should have no role at all in politics is to miss the boat entirely. Under the situation we have right now in America today, the militia units would not be forming to begin with if the political system were working properly and the people's legitimate problems were being dealt with by the system. But that is not happening, and the system is not responding that well to the standard corrective measures which have been used in the past to take care of such problems. Indeed, we have effectively seen the system bending over backwards to avoid taking into consideration some of the clearest voter mandates from the people that have occurred in decades.

We also see the government making continuing overtures that many people see as the prelude to weapons confiscations. The confiscation of our weapons is something that has to be prevented at all costs if we are to maintain a political system in this country anything at all like the Founding Fathers intended for us to have. But, isolated individuals acting on their own will accomplish little. Trained troops will usually triumph over unorganized armed mobs without too much effort. Just look at what the Israelis were doing on a regular basis to their opponents in relatively recent history. And there are few militia units in the United States today that are as well armed, trained and equipped as the Arab units were which were slaughtered wholesale in those battles.

The well regulated militias whose officers were appointed by the State governments, and whose training was the responsibility of the State governments have ceased to exist. The National Guard does not fill that bill as its officers are appointed by the national government and more and more we are seeing the national government either disbanding National Guard units or employing them overseas. The net result is to render them ineffective as any sort of check over the power of the national government. We have also seen that the State level governments as a rule do not seem to want to recreate their Constitutional State Militias. Indeed, more often than not, the State level governments permit themselves to be subordinated to a greater and greater degree to the national level government. Hence, the most effective check that the Founding Fathers placed on the power of the national level government has all but disappeared.

Given that this is the case, those people who see the problems in this situation have little choice but to exercise their rights as the Founding Fathers did initially and organize militia units regardless of the level of support or hostility that they receive from their national, state and local governments. The alternative is to permit yourself to be rendered all but helpless to reply to the threat of significant military force in any reasonable manner.

It is important to realize that those people who do this have the full support of the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution and the Common Law on their side. This is because if the government is not fulfilling its responsibilities, then it becomes the absolute duty of the citizens of this Republic to step in and fill the gap. The only limitations that they are effectively under is that banding together in a militia unit does not give the group as a whole any more legal rights or privileges than the individual members had to begin with. Regardless of what they call themselves or how they choose their officers, or what beliefs they may espouse, they do not have to authority to go and break the Common Law. Hence, the coercive force that they are practicing and learning to wield effectively can only be used in a defensive situation, when the government has finally gone beyond the pale. Now, while things in this country are bad and getting worse, they have not reached that point yet. So, militia units may effectively only meet, organize, equip and train until such time as the government forces them to take action to prevent its unjustified use of coercive force against the people.

Militia Organization:

There are several other matters which need to be mentioned in passing. Essentially, any militia unit which forms of its own accord and is not under government auspices is a volunteer unit. This means that the only reasonable method for it to use to select its officers is by the members of the unit electing one of their own to be the leader. It matters not what level of "military qualifications" the leader either has or does not have. It is expected that everybody is going to be vigorously training and improving their level of knowledge anyway.

Furthermore, in my time in the service I have observed senior military officers who could not pour piss out of a boot with the directions on the heel and would have a hard time leading dogs to chase cats. I have also encountered senior enlisted personnel on Flag Officers' Staffs who were as capable of leading a large scale unit as any officer could ever hope to be. The only way you can tell whether you are dealing with a good officer or a bad officer, or a good enlisted or a poor enlisted, is by personal interaction with them and observation. There is and should be no hard and fast rule which says that because somebody was only a sergeant in a branch of the military he can not be an officer in a militia unit. Furthermore, there are officers in the service who some people might not want as a stretcher bearer in their unit. There are also civilians who either by natural talent or by long study have developed a grasp of military strategy and tactics that would rival that of the most professionally competent military leader. You have to take each person as an individual and judge them by their merits.

The only way for a volunteer unit to make the choice as to which individual is to lead them is to elect that person. That also is no guarantee of getting good people either, but at least it leaves the members of the unit as the ones who bear the responsibility for picking the individual who will make their success as a unit or put most of them in body bags. It also gives them the flexibility to replace people at need. For volunteer organizations this is the only way to fly.

One of the other important decisions that needs to be made is whether the group wants to be an open, overt unit, or a closed, covert unit. There are advantages and disadvantages to both ways of doing things, and in the final analysis this should be left up to the people who are forming the unit. Now, there are those who do not like the idea of people forming "covert" militia units. To them I say, as long as a group of people is not breaking the Common Law, then why should it matter what they do in private? If they are breaking the Common Law, then they are criminals and should be dealt with accordingly. But if they are not breaking the Common Law, then it shouldn't be anybody else's business what they are or are not doing, where they chose to do it or not do it, and with whom.

Those who want to form covert units are well advised to keep them small, and composed of people who have known each other for a long period of time. There is no need to worry about growing in size, per se. The value of the covert unit is in its ability to stay in an area without getting noticed long after the balloon has gone up. To this end, a well trained and integrated squad size unit which has not been infiltrated is much more valuable than a platoon size unit which has been infiltrated and probably hasn't trained together that well either. The larger the unit the harder it is to train as a general rule, and the more land it has to have available to it so it can train without drawing attention to itself. You may want to have one member try to keep half an eye on any overt units in the area. If for no other reason than down the road it will give you a better idea of who you may want to try to integrate with.

Those people who want to try to form open units have to realize that public relations and education of the populace as a whole are going to end up being a large part of their mission, even if they did not plan for it initially. Try to select one member who is better at dealing with the press and appoint them as the Public Affairs Officer or Spokesman to handle any press releases or statements that need to get made. Get the rest of the group in the habit of referring any reporter type individual with questions to the spokesman. I would also recommend that at least one person from the unit make a courtesy call to visit with the local police chiefs and sheriffs. Remember that part of the mission of an open, above ground unit should be to support local law enforcement personnel with any reasonable and legitimate assistance they might need. So, at the very least, you can say that you have done at least minimal coordination with your local law enforcement people. If you get treated hostilely by the local law enforcement in spite of your best efforts to be reasonable and nonconfrontational, then perhaps

you should consider "disbanding" the public unit and letting some of the members form covert units if they desire to. At the very least, you may want to partially reorganize as a Political Action Committee to try to get somebody more reasonable into office.

Beyond just using plain old common sense, everything else is pretty much left to the discretion of the individual units. Realize that if you are setting yourselves up to be the defenders of the Constitution and the Common Law, then you are bound by their dictates. Also realize that anything you end up doing is going to require at least the passive support of your community over the long haul. So there is little to be gained by antagonizing your neighbors. Good luck and may God grant that our exercises stay academic.

- Mike Johnson/North Central Florida Regional Militia

PGP Public Key fingerprint

BF EB 27 F4 D2 86 EB 45 A9 63 A6 6F E3 6B 4A 8C

"There is something so far-fetched and so extravagant in the idea of danger to liberty from the militia that one is at a loss whether to treat it with gravity or with raillery; whether to consider it as a mere trial of skill, like the paradoxes of rhetoricians; or as a disingenuous artifice to instil prejudices at any price; or as the serious offspring of political fanaticism. Where in the name of common sense are our fears to end if we may not trust our sons, our brothers, our neighbors, our fellow citizens? What shadow of danger can there be from men who are daily mingling with the rest of their countrymen and who participate with them in the same feelings, sentiments, habits, and interests?"

- Alexander Hamilton, The Federalist # 29 (12)

=====Notes=====

(1) Declaration of Independence

(2) United States Constitution, Article I, section 8

(3) United States Constitution, Bill of Rights, 2nd Amendment

(4) Clinton Rossiter, editor, THE FEDERALIST PAPERS, Mentor Books, 1961, ISBN 0-451-62451-2, pp 184-185.

(5) IBID, p. 185

(6) Stephen P. Halbrook, THAT EVERY MAN BE ARMED, THE EVOLUTION OF A CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT, University of New Mexico Press, 1984, ISBN 0-8263-9764-7, p. 60.

(7) A.J. Langguth, PATRIOTS, THE MEN WHO STARTED THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION, Touchstone, 1989, ISBN 0-671-67562-1, p. 217

(8) Resolves Adopted in Charlotte Town, Mecklenberg County, North Carolina, May 31, 1775

(9) Carl von Clausewitz, ON WAR, translated by Col. J.J. Graham, edited and with an introduction by Anatol Rapoport, Penguin Books, 1968, ISBN 0-14-044427-0, p. 109.

(10) B. H. Liddell Hart, STRATEGY, SECOND REVISED EDITION, Meridian, 1991, ISBN 0-452-01071-3, p. 353.

(11) Sun Tzu, MANUAL FOR WAR, translated and edited by T.W. Kuo, Atli Press, 1989, ISBN 0-910169-02-0, p. 18. [PS: This is the best translation I have run across and I recommend it highly - Mike]

(12) Clinton Rossiter, op. cit., pp. 185-186.

=====

Permission is given to copy, repost and print this file out
as many times as desired as long as I am given credit for writing
it and it is used for educational purposes only.

-- Mike Johnson, June 12, 1995

.

.

Back to [Modern Militiaman, Issue #5](#)

Back to [The Patriot Coalition?](#)

Back to [Patrick Henry On-Line](#)

.

**** Last Kings, Chapter 1 ****

A LITTLE UNDER THREE MILLENIA AGO, A PROPHET named Elijah struggled, at God's behest, with the government of his day, one ruled openly by kings. These Israelite kings promoted the worship of a new god, the nature god Baal, to enhance their power. It wouldn't do for their people to attend the holy days at Solomon's temple in Jerusalem. They might want to reunite with their brothers, the Jews. So the new state god, Baal, was established, and woe unto anyone who followed the old ways. Worship of the LORD became synonymous with treason. What I am going to write about is Elijah's run-in with the King and the police forces of his day, as mentioned in II Kings, Chapter one.

IT MIGHT BE A PRETTY GOOD TALE, the reader might say. But what has that to do with today? Glad you asked.

In the best literary traditions of Geoffrey of Monmouth, Joseph Smith, Robert Graves, and Gary Jennings, I must, simply must, relate what happened to me the other day. I was turning up my garden to bury a duck when an angel appeared unto me and made me dig up a pot with a scroll inside. There, in the ancient Hebrew, which I was all of a sudden able to understand, was the expanded first chapter of II Kings. The angel commanded me to publish it. So I did, then the angel took off with the scroll and my understanding of ancient Hebrew. I'm going to put it in today's vernacular: Angry White Male Redneck-Peckerwoodese. Here goes:

Last Kings, Chapter 1

Verse 1 -- Then a whole bunch of pissed-off people called Moabites rebelled because they wouldn't put up with any more of the King's shit and they sure weren't scared of Ahab's boy.

Verse 2 -- And the King fell off the bed and through a lattice in the White Palace while screwing his latest whore, and his right and third leg just wouldn't heal. So he sent messengers and told them, "Go, ask Baalzebub, the Philistine State God of Healing at Ekron, if this is just another sore and when I'll get better. I sure feel my pain."

Verse 3 -- But the angel of the LORD said to Elijah the Tishbite, "Get up and go down to meet the messengers of the king and tell them, "What! There's no God in Israel that you gotta go down and lick the bronze butt of Baalzebub, Philistine State God of Healing in Ekron?"

Verse 4 -- "Now the LORD says this, "Your pecker will turn black and fall off. Then you will die of frustration because of no more bimbos and because you lie so much that nobody will bother to listen to you anymore. Plus the Queen will nag you to death." Elijah nodded, then left.

Verse 5 -- And when the King's messengers returned, the king asked, "Back so soon?"

Verse 6 -- They told him, "Some holy geezer pestered the shit out of us and he told us to come back and tell you this: "The LORD says, "Is there no God in Israel that you gotta kiss Baalzebub's bronze ass in Ekron? Your pecker will turn black and fall off. No more whores, everyone will ignore you because you lie so much. The queen will nag you to death. You will die of frustration."

Verse 7 -- "Who was that mean old holy geezer?" the king asked.

Verse 8 -- And they answered him, "He was a hairy guy, with a girdle of leather about his nuts." And the king said, "Elijah, the Tishbite!"

Verse 9 -- Then the king sent a captain of fifty with his fifty agents: the King's Bureau of Wine, Hashish, and Swords, the King's Bureau of Investigation, the King's Sneakret Service, the King's Marshalls, a whole alphabet soup of King's goons. The captain, a slick young thug, saw Elijah sitting atop a hill. Scattering his men in a

circle around the hill, the captain held a pair of shackles as he climbed the hill saying, "Don't mess with me. I killed a whole bunch of weavers in their hut, speared them all in the back. My best man shot an arrow into the wife's head. We are the King's men and we will never be held to account." As he neared Elijah, the captain said, "Now you had better cooperate with me and the King, you smelly old man of God, or I'll slap a harelip on you faster than you can say "Police Brutality."

Verse 10 -- And Elijah rolled his eyes, shook his head, and said to the young police thug commanding fifty, "If I be a man of God, then let fire come down from heaven, and consume you and your fifty murderers." With a Whoosh!, fire came down from heaven, burning to death fifty-one murderous King's rascals.

Verse 11 -- Then the King sent out another chief goon of fifty with his fifty. The captain, a grizzled old killer, looked at the remains of the previous fifty-one and said, "Funny, I thought we were the only ones allowed to besiege people on private property, then burn them to death. No matter," he said as he drew his sword. 'The King wanted you two hours ago, so get your nasty old man-of-God ass right down here -- now!"

Verse 12 -- And Elijah answered and said unto them, "You murderous pigs won't learn, will you? Very well then, if I be a man of God, let fire come down from heaven, and consume you and your fifty." And the fire of God came down from heaven, and consumed him and his fifty.

Verse 13 -- And the king sent again a captain of the third fifty with his fifty. And the third captain of fifty saw the damage about the hill. He soiled his armor. So did the rest of the King's men. It's a whole lot more fun to kill unarmed civilians than to be killed yourself. The captain crawled up the hill like a scared snake, and came and fell on his knees before Elijah, and besought him, and said unto him, "Oh man of God, I pray you, please, please, please let my life, and the life of these fifty of your servants, be precious in thy sight." Then the king's bureaucrat peed in his armor again.

Verse 14 -- "I see that there came fire down from heaven, and burnt up the two captains of the former fifties with their fifties: therefore let my life now be precious in thy sight. To hell with the rest. Even though I set fire to the King's tower the other day and roasted some of the King's men and serving women and their babies, and blamed it on a Moabite in a speeding oxcart carrying a load of manure, an unregistered dagger, and no road tax license from the King. It's not all my fault. I had the help of the scribes and town criers, S.O.B.s (Sons of Belial) all, who helped me put the blame onto the rebellious Moabites. The common people didn't want to find out any different, because they lack the physical and moral courage to do anything about it. It ain't fair that I should burn without all my crooked buddies getting the same as well. Everyone knows that the King can do whatever he wants."

Verse 15 -- Elijah wanted to call down fire on this rascal and his lot. But the angel of the LORD said unto Elijah, "Go down with him: be not afraid of him. He and his fifty will get the same fate on earth as the King and his family -- serving as dog and bird food." So Elijah arose, and went down with him unto the king, keeping a twenty pace margin upwind.

Verse 16 -- And Elijah said unto the King, "Thus saith the LORD, forasmuch as you have sent messengers to brown-nose to Baalzebub, Philistine State God of Healing in Ekron, is it not because there is no God in Israel to inquire of his word? Therefore you shall not come down off that bed you lie on and every place else for that matter. Your pecker will turn black and fall off. You will die of frustration because there will be no more whores for you. Nobody will listen to anything you say, especially after today, and the Queen will help nag you to death. I've had enough of you." Then Elijah left the White Palace.

Verse 17 -- So the king died according to the word of the LORD which Elijah had spoken. Nobody missed him except the whores and other Sons of Belial, (S.O.B.s) and even them not too much.

AND THAT'S PRETTY MUCH THE WAY IT WAS. Ahab's line came to an end when a rebellious general named Jehu killed Jehoram. Jehu ordered Queen Jezebel thrown out of a window, and before he got around to burying her, the dogs ate all of her except her head, hands and feet. Jehu killed all of Ahab's children, Ahab's State-God Priests, and Ahab's Kingsmen, at least all that he could find. Since Jehu did such an efficient job of it,

God promised him that his dynasty would last four generations. God kept his word. Regrettably, Jehu soon turned out to be as wicked as Ahab's bunch. God got tired of the Israelites and he allowed the Assyrians to take them away in captivity, where they were scattered and never heard of again.

THREE THOUSAND YEARS HAVE PASSED, and people still remain the same.

This article first published in *The Southwestern Missouri Libertarian*, Issue #11, April-May 1995

Website Contents:

[Home](#)
[Specials!](#)
[PHILOSOPHY...](#)
[Selected Works](#)
[SURVIVAL FOODS](#)
[SELF-DEFENSE](#)
[Surper Survival DVD's](#)
[FORWARDS](#)
[NEW STUFF!](#)

Welcome To Our "Selected Works of Kurt Saxon & Other Fine Folk" Section

Visit Our
Online
CATALOG

CRIME PAYS

By Kurt Saxon

When I was a child there was a radio program in which the announcer would say, "Crime does not pay". But crime did pay then and it certainly pays now. And I don't mean that crime only pays the criminal.

It is true that one who commits a crime has little chance of being caught. It is also true that if he is caught, there is little chance he will be convicted. If convicted, there is little chance of his doing time. If he does time, there is little chance of his serving his full term.

These are well-known facts which encourage criminality. But what most people fail to realize is that the entire criminal justice system itself is one of the greatest industries in our country. Many billions of dollars annually are taken in by our criminal justice system and without an ever-rising crime rate, our economy would suffer.

In New York City, alone, there are 30,000 police officers who earn at least \$400.00 weekly. These are needed to contend with the hoards of habitual criminals whose only function is to rob, rape, maim and kill.

Nearly all of these criminals have records showing their hatred for their betters. An efficient system would round them up and destroy them all. That would cut down on the need for police officers to maybe 5,000 to patrol, manage traffic, answer emergency calls and protect and serve as police officers are supposed to do.

But without the habitual criminal to take up most of the police officer's time, 25,000 New York cops would be unemployed. Employment has become more important than public safety. And this is not simply in New York, but nationwide.

The criminal justice system, from the cop in his patrol car to the U.S. Department of Justice, millions of noncriminals, make a good living off criminality. When a prison is to be built at a cost of 200 to 500 million dollars, the politicians awarding the contracts often get large rake-offs. The building contractors certainly make a large profit. Those supplying food, clothing, etc., to the prisoners, pay their bills because of those who prey on society. The guards and the wardens live well because society pays well to keep society's predators alive.

The cops, prosecutor, the defense attorneys, the judges, the bailiffs, the court reporters, the bail bondsmen and the janitors all profit from crime. If criminals were ever forced to serve their entire sentence, thus keeping them out of circulation for years instead of months, employees of the criminal justice system would suffer dramatically. Habitual criminals commit crimes while out on bail and especially while out on parole. Those who allow them their freedom before and after whatever sentence they serve, have a vested interest in their freedom to commit crimes.

When Florida cops were searching for the murderers of a British tourist they came up with a thirteen year old suspect who had been arrested 93 times! Reason dictates that the young monster should have been put to sleep after his third offense proved an established habit pattern of criminality.



Hertz

Prepay & save up to
20% off
the base rate.*

BOOK NOW

*Applies to Pay Later base rates. Taxes & fees excluded. Terms apply.

But consider his profit to the criminal justice system. Ninety-three arrests and who knows how many convictions? If things were to stay the same, he would represent millions of dollars in his lifetime. He is a gold mine, except to those he robs, rapes, maims and kills. The tragedies he and those like him leave in their wakes is a small price to pay for job security, legal fees and high level careers in the criminal justice system.

Not too long ago an on-the-street interviewer had his crew focus the camera on a drug deal going on a block away from a group of cops standing on the sidewalk socializing. He called their attention to the crime in progress and one middle-aged officer said frankly that the judge would only let them go and so made no move to do anything.

That cop knows which side his bread is buttered on. Like many cops, he knows the drug dealer is, in a sense, his employer. He knows the "war on drugs" is a joke. Drugs pump about as much money into the criminal justice system as they do into the pockets of the drug dealers.

The phony war on drugs has caused a social nightmare scarcely hinted at by the prohibition of alcohol seventy years ago. Like during Prohibition, yet another and stronger set of criminals has arisen.

The profitable seduction of addictive personalities has given us a class of addicts far worse than alcoholics. The misery caused by the drug trade has cost billions to industry and has endangered the lives of more non-involved people than any criminal enterprise in history.

China has no drug problem. Both the pusher and the addict are shot!

A hundred years ago, anyone could go into a pharmacy and buy raw opium or any narcotic then known. Drugs were not a social problem. Of course, the immediate family of the addict was blighted. But no more than the immediate family of the alcoholic then and now.

Drugs were cheap and legal and there was no profit in causing anyone to take them. People felt that if a weak person chose to damage his already inferior brain, it was his choice and his death was no loss. They were right. So they let it alone and there was no base to build criminality on.

Only in our time, with a government so weakened by corruption that such a base for criminality was welcome, could an alliance between drug traffickers and government take place. Prohibition taught rational and decent folk that the attempted cure was far worse than the disease. But the powers that be remembered that Prohibition not only created a new criminal element, it also created a much stronger police presence. More police are desired by all who wish for more power over their citizens and/or fear revolution.

Throughout the ages, tyrannies have used any pretext to enlarge their police forces. The public reason is to fight crime but the private reason is to insure their safety from a population awakened to their corruption, incompetence, etc.

Communist Russia, as oppressive as it was and as efficient as its police forces seemed, had a large class of professional criminals. The criminal, if so sloppy as to force his capture, was far better treated than was the political prisoner and was released sooner. Even Nazi Germany had its criminals, who fared better in the concentration camps, and were usually released alive, unlike those opposed to the regime. So the very police who were supposed to protect and serve were actually used to keep the law-abiding citizens in line.

So the war on drugs has two purposes. The first and the most obvious is the employment of so many in our criminal justice system. The second is the strengthening of the criminal justice system to counteract growing unrest.

But they all say their actions are for the good of the public at large. Many in the criminal justice system even put on a show of righteous indignation at the criminal element. Even jailers complain about crowding and beg forgiveness for releasing murderous felons on the public.

Of course, they all excuse their actions by saying they are compelled, even against their will, to observe the rights of criminals. Although, historically, one who violated the rights of another, forfeited his own, our system has a vested interest in granting rights to predators.

But have you ever considered what a right is? The term "rights" has been sanctified, both religiously and civically. "God given rights". "Inalienable rights". "Natural rights". All nonsense! These terms sound nice but only serve to give a false sense of security to those who believe that rights are somehow guaranteed.

Consider. If God gave you a right to life, could any punk take it away? Forget any punishment to the punk; your right from God would have been taken away by a lesser being. Impossible.

Inalienable right? If a right can be alienated and all of them are, frequently, it isn't inalienable.

Natural right? What's that?

A right is a social privilege, usually recognized by the state. It can be violated or withheld at the whim of an individual, society or the state. Rights have to be stood up for, fought for and there must be a willingness to destroy anyone who consistently violates the rights of others, if rights are to have any meaning.

Of course, there are also conflicting rights. These are rights given to losers to compensate for and excuse inferiority. Our Founding Fathers gave us rights to enable the individual to exercise his abilities and keep what he earned through the use of those abilities. These rights are being eroded by conflicting rights given to those without ability and so unable to earn anything.

The rights given to the inferior and amended to the Constitution are most often referred to to prevent the criminal from getting his just deserts. Our Founding Fathers never dreamed of giving rights to those who rob, rape, maim and kill.

Those who finally accepted the original Constitution would have hanged over 90% of our repeat offenders. The term "Constitutional rights" has been so perverted that the entire Constitution is in danger of being overridden by our own government.

Clinton is even now proposing the addition of 100,000 police nationwide. Why? To further institutionalize the whole of our populace? To suppress civil unrest as his faltering system creates more desperation?

His reasons are meaningless since his overall incompetence insures the collapse of our system. But as in so many societies controlled by incompetents, for incompetents, those making money off the criminal justice system are increasingly willing to arm the system against their fellow citizens.

Part of the solution to the crime problem would be to simply rescind the rights of felons and kill all repeat offenders. Our species is the only one which deliberately nurtures its own parasites and predators. But thankfully, not all of our species do so willingly. Only those blinded by profits and power give reasons for keeping alive those who would destroy us.

Fully 80% of all serious crime is caused by only 20% of the criminal element. These are repeat offenders, career and habitual criminals. All have established habit patterns of predation. They are degenerates by any rational standards.

They are not only our greatest economic liability but a threat to our system, our civilization and to our species itself.

There is no rational reason to keep them alive at such a sacrifice, or any sacrifice, for that matter. Unfortunately, they will not be done away with by our present administration. The collapse will come and most of them will perish in the resulting chaos, along with most of those presently in power.

But when the worst has passed and normal humans take over, such vermin will be destroyed as a matter of course. When ridding society of their kind becomes policy, we will need few police. Then we will live in an age when crime doesn't pay anyone at all.

Web Site Contents (Unless Mentioned Otherwise) ©2012 By Atlan Formularies, Post Office Box 95, Alpena, Arkansas 72611-0095
Phone: 870-437-2999 - Fax: Out of Order - Email: [Addresses](#)

[[Back](#)] [[Home](#)] [[Up](#)] [[Next](#)]



Online Store Software by Earth Skater.

Selected Columns, Vin Suprynowic

Editor's Note: Mr. Suprynowic is one of the few true Libertarians who has been consistently on the side of the militia movement. He has never shown our cause anything other than a reasoned understanding of what we must do and why we must follow our course of action.

Below are some of Mr. Suprynowic's columns reproduced in part which show that there are some original thinkers who understand our movement in large part **better** than do some militiamen.

From the [January 26, 1997 issue](#):

Pro-government extremists will argue that, in each case, if these citizens had docilely allowed armed strangers to have their way, they might still be alive.

But this does not constitute a rebuttal to my contention that we are now living in a police state. Rather, it merely constitutes advice on how we might behave if we hope to survive a little longer in a police state.

Short-sighted advice.

The Jews of Eastern Europe figured their best course was to passively obey the authorities in 1942. We all know where that got them.

Our judges are now issuing search warrants which allow police to invade private property without notice, and murder any law-abiding citizen they find there, on as flimsy a pretext as "searching for fake ID."

The mistake made by David Aguilar and Ralph Garrison was not in taking up arms to defend their homes, families, and neighborhoods. That is the right of every American.

They made their mistakes when they allowed themselves to be outgunned, when they failed to wear Kevlar, and when they decided to confront their violent assailants directly, rather than waiting with longer-range weapons in positions of concealment.

The people will re-learn these lessons eventually ... if only through genetic selection.

From the [January 6, 1997 column](#):

. . . Do cops on duty want to be treated as individuals?
Do they expect us to take the time to form an individual judgment about whether we should obey them each time they give an order, depending on whether they seem like "good cops" or "bad cops"?

I can no longer bring myself to say that, for two reasons:

First, although I have no trouble believing that some cops actually joined the force out of a naive desire to protect the defenseless, and that they believe in their own hearts they will resign if ever ordered to violate someone's basic constitutional rights ... those cops are fooling themselves.

Who could make it all the way through the academy without realizing he or she will be asked to rough up and bust people for possessing intoxicants less dangerous than legal alcohol ... intoxicants which we all know were only outlawed in the first place because they were the drugs of choice of our black, Mexican and Asian minorities?

Who could make it through the academy without realizing he or she will be expected to enthusiastically participate in sending people -- but only poor people -- to prison for possessing weapons less dangerous than those handy in the trunk of most patrol cars ... despite the obvious ban on such persecution in the plain language of the Second Amendment?

Who could spend a month on the beat without learning such "tricks of the trade" as the infamous "command voice," the "question that sounds like an order" which allows police to routinely bypass the Constitution when it comes to tricking or bullying folks into "voluntarily" waiving their right to be free of warrantless searches?

When do these "good cops" plan to resign?

But the second reason all Metro police must and will be treated with considerably less trust following the murder of Daniel Mendoza comes in the form of a simple question: Why do police wear uniforms?

Think about it.

If you were drafted and sent overseas to fight a war, and saw someone running toward you, carrying a rifle and wearing an enemy uniform, how long would you spend trying to determine whether said advancing gentleman was a "good enemy soldier" or a "bad enemy soldier"?

No time at all. Uniforms are designed to help you make an instantaneous decision not to shoot a "friendly." You shoot the bad uniform.

Do cops on duty want to be treated as individuals? Do they expect us to take the time to form an individual judgment about whether we should obey them each time they give an order, depending on whether they seem like "good cops" or "bad cops"?

They do not. They expect us to obey the uniform, and the gun. That's why they do their best to all look alike.

No, I don't mean to say anyone should go around shooting cops at random. Please don't do that. But they can't have it both ways. Police officers cannot say "Don't question me; obey the uniform," when it suits them, but then turn around and whine "The actions of a few bad apples in uniform shouldn't make folks lose confidence in the honesty of all other cops."

At least, they can no longer expect me to say it for them.

Let's face it. The old screening process, designed to make sure cops are solid, mature, thoughtful men with the experience to calmly stare down a mob ("one riot, one Texas Ranger," as the old saying went) has long since been abandoned as we rush to bloat the ranks of "the khaki gang" with enough gung ho young high school bullies to enforce more and more laws -- all-embracing webs of laws which only make society more chaotic, diminishing respect for a legal code no one can keep track of, which police are thus left free to enforce more and more selectively, based mainly on who cowers with proper respect, and who mouths off.

. . . If you shoot us down like animals, we may cower for a time. But when we see no other escape, and finally turn on you, do not think that then you can say "Hang on now, be reasonable; let's talk."

Seeing that the badger is a small, inoffensive-looking creature, many have considered cornering, capturing, and domesticating him.

But no one has ever tried it twice.

From the [March 23, 1997 column](#):

"You are delusional, angry to the point of blindness, and just foolish if you think that those who've enforced a policy that they're employed to enforce should be subjected to a 'forced dosing.' I do hope you were kidding. If you have a problem with the policy which those enforcement officers didn't create, that's fine, but to say that they should be subjected to inhumane treatment in the name of 'your cause' is callous, in flagrant disregard of human rights and respect, and vicious."

I responded:

Gosh, I certainly hope we didn't hang anyone at Nuremberg for "enforcing a policy that they were employed to enforce," and "which those enforcement officers didn't create." I'm sure our policy there was to punish no one for depriving another of his God-given human and civil rights, so long as he first donned a uniform and "followed orders" ... wasn't it?

. . . If you do NOT believe the majority has such a right to impose its will on others through armed force, then I welcome your vote to legalize all drug use.

If you DO believe the majority has such a right, then what possible objection can you have to my proposing that - if and when those who believe as I do attain majority control - we have a precisely similar right to FORCE unwanted drug use on all you benighted "straights"?

. . . Yet those who fought a "War on Alcohol" were finally forced to acknowledge ... in 1933, and to the benefit of all ... that their police-state efforts had never succeeded in

manufacturing anything but massive social pathologies. When do YOU plan to stop torturing, beating, murdering, imprisoning and impoverishing others (or hiring surrogates to do so), for their personal choices, to placate your own personal demons?

Of course, you have an alternative. You can embrace the case for personal liberty NOW. It's entirely up to you.

The problem with these fearless Drug Warriors - like so many who fall in love with the uniforms and the adrenalin rush of "night exercises" against the defenseless and the unprepared - is that they never stop to think what actually, usually happens to folks who start a war of aggression ... and lose. What generally happens is that they are all killed, sold into slavery, or (if the victors are feeling particularly charitable) locked up in prisoner-of-war camps while the victors get children on their women, and teach the resulting tots to play baseball.

They have attacked us, by surprise, in our homes in the dark of night. They have violated our Bill of Rights. They have shot us, jailed us, terrorized us, seized our homes, bank accounts and property. They have ruined our lives and our peace of mind. They have made "registered criminals" of dying cancer patients and the doctors who dared to prescribe them enough opiates to soothe their pain and allow them a few peaceful final days with their families.

We have for far too long allowed these life-hating zealots to proceed on the unchallenged assumption that if they lose their "War on Drugs" they'll be allowed to simply shrug, say "What the heck, we meant well" and live out their years -- on pensions funded by our tax dollars -- fishing on the lake.

Instead, we must impress on these characters a replacement paradigm. They have launched and fought an aggressive war against a peaceful people, who wanted only to control their own bodies, their own medical practices, their own states of consciousness.

The most extreme response would be to assert our moral right to kill unprovoked violent aggressors, in self-defense. If we're feeling more kind-hearted, we of course can apply their own doctrine - the doctrine that the majority has some moral right to enforce its ideas about "proper" states of consciousness on others - against them, locking them up and dosing them with a randomized selection of consciousness-altering drugs until they are babbling, harmless burn-outs, no longer able to endanger our children.

If they don't like these options, I've already proposed that we offer them a limited window of opportunity to drop to their knees, apologize for the trouble their insane religious zealotry has caused us all, and plead for amnesty.

What's "vicious" about that?

Review-Journal. Readers may contact him via e-mail at
vin@lvrj.com.

Now reaching more than a million readers, the column is syndicated in the United States and Canada via Mountain Media Syndications, P.O. Box 4422, Las Vegas Nev. 89127. Ask the editor why your daily newspaper doesn't carry "The Libertarian."

.

.

Back to [Modern Militiaman, Issue #5](#)

Back to [The Patriot Coalition?](#)

Back to [Patrick Henry On-Line](#)

.

Patriot Riddle,

Patriot Answer.

On March 1, 1997 I posted the following riddle:

Name for me the successful "freedom-fighter" who wrote these words, won his war and then went on to become a leader of his country.

The first person who can name for me the successful "terrorist" and specific document wherein his words are published will win the one print copy of *Modern Militiaman* (#5) which is printed to give a First Amendment "press" patina on sedition.

The other nine runners-up will receive a formatted copy in either Windows Write 3.1 or Word4Windows 6.0 to print out for themselves.

The words and phases which are underscored have been substituted by myself to help conceal the identity of the author and to illustrate why the *Modern Militiaman* should have an undying remorseless hatred of today's decayed parasitic criminal elites and their supporters.

To them I say: **"Better save the first bullet for yourselves."**

--Martin Lindstedt
Managing Editor, *The Modern Militiaman*.

.



.

. . . . What can such a man have to tell us; what message can come from him except a message of hate?

Let us try, without fear, favour, or prejudice, to understand the meaning of the awful word "hate" in this connection. You may ask me: Was there "hate" in our actions, in our revolt against corrupt rule of our country, and is that emotion expressed in this book written by the man who bore the burden of responsibility and subsequently wrote about the facts of the revolt?

To such a question the sincere answer is "Yes."

But was it hatred of the American people as such? The sincere answer is "No."

It is axiomatic that those who fight have to hate --something or somebody. And we fought. We had to hate first and foremost, the horrifying, age-old, inexcusable moral defenselessness of our productive people, slaving through centuries, ... to the majority whose elites the productiveness of the free was a standing invitation to steal from them. We had to hate the humiliating disgrace of the apathy of our people. We had to hate -- as any nation worthy of the name must and always must hate -- the rule of the criminal, rule, unjust and unjustifiable, per se, criminal rule . . . in our own country.

And, naturally, we had to hate all those who, equipped with modern arms and the ancient machinery of the gallows, barred the way of honest people to enjoy the fruits of their own labor, . . . denied them the means of individual defense, frustrated their efforts for personal independence, and ruthlessly withstood their efforts to reclaim that which was theirs.

Who will condemn the hatred of evil that springs from the love of what is good and just? Such hatred has been the driving force of progress in the world's history -- "not peace but a sword" in the cause of mankind's advancement. And in our case, such hate has been nothing more and nothing less than a manifestation of that highest human feeling: love. For if you love Freedom, you must hate Slavery; if you love your people, you cannot but hate the internal enemies that compass their destruction; if you love your country, you cannot but hate those who seek to loot her for their own profit. Simply put: if you love your mother, would you not hate the man who sought to rape her: would you not hate him and fight him at the cost, if needs be, of your own life?

This is a fundamental human question in the violent and stormy world of today. Let every decent man search his soul and decently answer. Because ultimately the hope of every people lies in the readiness of its sons to stake their lives "for their mothers," for freedom which man loves, against serfdom which man hates and should hate in the name of his love.

. . . And truth compels him to ask himself in the presence of his readers, . . . this testing question: If ever again your people should find themselves in a position like that in which they were when you had to "go underground," to fight, to become a hunted "rebel" -- in such circumstances would you do what you did then?

The answer is definitely: "Yes."



I have written this book primarily for my own people, lest the Jew forget again -- as he so disastrously forgot in the past -- this simple truth: that there are things more precious than life, and more horrible than death.

But I have also written this book also for Gentiles, lest they be unwilling to realize, or all too ready to overlook, the fact that out of blood and fire and tears and ashes a new specimen of human being was born, a specimen completely unknown to the world for over eighteen hundred years, "the Fighting Jew." That Jew, whom the world considered dead and buried never to rise again, has risen. For he has learned that "simple truth" of life and death, and he will never again go down to the sides of the pit and vanish from the earth.

Amongst my Gentile readers I wish to address a special message to the British reader. He will read in the following pages some harsh words about some of his rulers, their policies, their agents; and he may feel that some of the strictures fall gratuitously upon himself as citizen voter in a democratic state. It would not be surprising, therefore, if he should feel himself prejudiced both against the author and the book. After all, for years the author fought against the British authorities. He was described by British newspapers, by members of both Houses of Parliament, by Ministers of State, by generals, admirals, bishops, lawyers, and all the other *dramatis personae* who "give the clues for cheers and boos" to the ordinary citizen -- as "Terrorist Number One" in Eretz Israel, then called Palestine and ruled by the British government.

I will not offend my British reader's ears with a repetition of all the other offensive names which were used by way of enlightening him concerning the author of this book, during the years of the struggle. He can, if he so desires, take his pick from the rich international vocabulary of name-calling. It is only natural, therefore, that many English readers will ask quite sincerely: What can such a man have to tell us; what message can come from him except a message of hate?

Let us try, without fear, favour, or prejudice, to understand the meaning of the awful word "hate" in this connection. You may ask me: Was there "hate" in our actions, in our revolt against British rule

of our country, and is that emotion expressed in this book written by the man who bore the burden of responsibility and subsequently wrote about the facts of the revolt?

To such a question the sincere answer is "Yes."

But was it hatred of the British people as such? The sincere answer is "No."

It is axiomatic that those who fight have to hate -- something or somebody. And we fought. We had to hate first and foremost, the horrifying, age-old, inexcusable utter DEFENSELESSNESS of our Jewish people, wandering through millennia, through a cruel world to the majority whose inhabitants the defenselessness of the Jews was a standing invitation to massacre them. We had to hate the humiliating disgrace of homelessness of our people. We had to hate -- as any nation worthy of the name must and always must hate -- the rule of the foreigner, rule, unjust and unjustifiable, *per se*, *foreign* rule in the land of our ancestors, in our own country. We had to hate the barring of the gates of our own country to our brethren, trampled and bleeding and crying out for help in a world morally deaf.

And, naturally, we had to hate all those who, equipped with modern arms and the ancient machinery of the gallows, barred the way of our people to physical salvation, denied them the means of individual defense, frustrated their efforts for national independence, and ruthlessly withstood their efforts to regain their national honor and restore their self-respect.

Who will condemn the hatred of evil that springs from the love of what is good and just? Such hatred has been the driving force of progress in the world's history -- "not peace but a sword" in the cause of mankind's advancement. And in our case, such hate has been nothing more and nothing less than a manifestation of that highest human feeling: love. For if you love Freedom, you must hate Slavery; if you love your people, you cannot but hate the foreign enemies that compass their destruction; if you love your country, you cannot but hate those who seek to annex it. Simply put: if you love your mother, would you not hate the man who sought to kill her: would you not hate him and fight him at the cost, if needs be, of your own life?

This is a fundamental human question in the violent and stormy world of today. Let every decent man search his soul and decently answer. Because ultimately the hope of every people lies in the readiness of its sons to stake their lives "for their mothers," for freedom which man loves, against serfdom which man hates and should hate in the name of his love.

The author has not written these preliminary lines in order to make harsh words less galling and bitter truths more palatable. He has written them, as he has written the whole of this book, for the sake of truth. And truth compels him to ask himself in the presence of his readers, Gentile readers and hostile readers, this testing question: If ever again your people should find themselves in a position like that in which they were when you had to "go underground," to fight, to become a hunted "rebel" -- in such circumstances would you do what you did then?

The answer is definitely: "Yes."

Introduction of "*The Revolt*" by Menachem Begin, 1951. .

The winner was:

Date: Sun, 2 Mar 1997 12:41:18 -0500 (EST)
From: ????????@aol.com
To: mlindste@clandjop.com
Subject: Re: Patriot Riddle - ANSWERED?

Menachem Begin in "The Revolt."

I received four other guesses, three requests for information, and, proving that the audience understood my point thoroughly, three requests to be purged from my e-mailing list. Which I did with extreme prejudice. All three of them were from my "Libertarian" list, and one of them is a law student, which underscores that the decaying and parasitic elites know exactly who they are, and which side they are on.

The guesses, albeit wrong, will receive via e-mail or by floppy an electronic version of Issue #5 because they were runners up by default.

I recommend that every single militiaman worthy of the name read Menacham Begin's "The Revolt." Menacham Begin was a patriot, and it was understood that his people, the Jews, came first and foremost with him. There was no sacrifice too great, and no moral imperative he would not follow to save his people. There was not an ounce of compromise, not a shred of cowardice in that man, not a single sanctimonious verbal misrepresentation of where he stood. Begin did whatever he had to do to save his people, who were kept from emigration into Palestine by the British while their co-religionists were being slaughtered by the hundreds of thousands in Europe. The British wanted to maintain their empire in Palestine by playing the Arabs against the Jews. Eventually, thanks to men like Menacham Begin, the British had to leave once the natives got wise to them and became rambunctious. A process begun in America and ending in Africa.

The purpose of my riddle was to show, with the substitution of a few words, the relevancy of Menacham Begin's words from 1951, when he fought an outside enemy -- to today -- when the Modern Militiaman faces an enemy more cruel, more vicious, and more destructive than any foreign invader -- the group of parasites who presently rule over us under facade of democratic government.

There have been, in every civilization, certain internal parasites who have the notion that when outsiders are not available for exploitation, that their own people will do very nicely. So they expand the powers of their office, make more new laws, raise taxes, send the kids of the working poor to die in foreign wars for their own glory, and otherwise drain all the productive efforts of their citizens to their own ends. These illegitimate goals are carried out under color of legitimate "laws" and "taxes"; enforced by police, lawyers, judges, and, in the latter stages, by military force.

These parasites destroy first those outside common society, but eventually the loss of societal vigor is felt throughout the society. Reaction first starts out with random sporadic violence, but as sides are taken, the amount of conflict expands. As there is less and less to steal, and honest men learn they must fight to keep hold of the dwindling means of survival, society degenerates in a crescendo of violence. Eventually the cycle crashes, with the survivors destroying the remaining old, tired, corrupt elites who survived, and the cycle of empire begins anew -- but usually with a new, uncorrupted people because the weakened survivors are fit only to pine for past glories without understanding of the reasons things went so horribly wrong.

Once you know which side you are on, you will understand that which you must do.

That, my comrades, is the deeper meaning to the riddle I posed.

--Martin Lindstedt
Managing Editor, The **Modern Militiaman**.

Back to [Modern Militiaman, Issue #5](#)

Back to [*The Patriot Coalition?*](#)

Back to [Patrick Henry On-Line](#)

REP.CHARLES KEY
STATE CAPITOL BLDG.
ROOM 508
OKLAHOMA CITY, OK 73105
(405)521.2711

COMMITTEES:
CRIMINAL JUSTICE
EDUCATION
BANKING & FINANCE
WILDLIFE

House Of Representatives

March 12, 1997

Dear Concerned Citizen:

My name is Charles Key and I'd like to share some personal and inside information with you.

I'm an Oklahoma State Representative. I humbly ask you to spare a few minutes to read some things that you have probably never seen before on TV or read in the newspapers about some shocking events associated with the Oklahoma City bombing.

Regardless what city or state you're from, you will likely be affected more than you may ever know by that bombing and pending trials.

On April 19, 1995 when I heard the news (and literally heard the explosion) of the Murrah building I was dumbfounded.

As the realization sunk in that so many people and children were killed, I, along with millions of others watching news coverage, felt that indescribable, overwhelming sensation in the pit of my stomach.

Yet, as the "story" unfolded, my spirits were lifted as I saw example after example of sheer human compassion and an outpouring of unblemished, unconditional love flow forth in a far greater degree than I had ever seen in any venue of life, including and especially in political circles.

Put more bluntly, that sacrificial selflessness and unity was the very antithesis of the type of behavior that so typically embodies politics.

How refreshing it was to see people helping people without the proverbial ugly political head rearing up asking, "What's in it for me?" or "Why should I do that?"

As the weeks passed, I saw Godbreathed compassion by the citizens of Oklahoma and from many other states who joined in to help. Those memories will never leave my mind and nothing can eradicate the great amount of good that was done by those thousands of acts of kindness.

As a matter of fact, it is that very visible love that helped me hang on for the two tough years that followed. (I hope you will take the time to read more about those years in the following pages.)

Over the next few weeks, inconsistencies began emerging. Stories kept changing and although I couldn't see the emerging political angle, I could sense it.

Consider the following facts which caused me to become initially concerned.

Fact #1:

The initial A.P.B. (All Points Bulletin) was for Middle Eastern John Does in a brown pick-up truck. The Jordanian brought back from London who had apparent bomb making materials in his suitcase and other John Doe suspects who were described as Middle Eastern.

Fact #2:

Those Middle Eastern reports quickly vanished. Why?...

Fact #3:

The 1200 pound ammonium nitrate bomb "grew" continuously from 1200 to 2400 to 4800 pounds.

Fact #4:

The early reports told us about explosives inside the Murrah Building. Remember how the rescue effort was "put on hold" while the bomb squad entered the building to search for and take out those intentionally placed internal explosives? Then those reports were described in detail by local U.S. Congressmen and bomb experts interviewed in studio by the media.

Fact #5:

Those reports also disappeared or were explained away as dummy or 'for show' items.

Fact #6:

Those who dared oppose the REVISIONIST NEWS ACCOUNTS, were ostracized, mocked, discredited, dark-cornered, etc. I know, I was one who dared to be politically incorrect.

2

Fact #7:

The ATF (Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms) had field agents assigned to the office at the Murrah Building. Yet, on the day of the bombing, not one of those agents were killed. They were mysteriously, uncharacteristically absent from the building that morning.

At some point it became painfully apparent that there was more wrong than right with the federal investigation. That is

when I had a very tough decision to make. Should I sit and do nothing and remain in my comfort zone simply "playing the part" of the caring politician for the photo op's? Or should I really do the right thing even if it meant giving the phrase "politically incorrect" a whole new dimension?

It didn't take long after discussing it with my wife to determine that I had to do the right thing -- no matter what the consequences were to be.

Having come to that conclusion, I decided to go forward to search out the truth and tell it to a waiting world.. Little did I know the onslaught I was about to embrace.

Before I go on to tell you what I did that I believed was right, allow me to tell you what some in the establishment news media and political circles claimed I was doing wrong.

Major media has launched unheard of attacks against our desire to conduct constitutionally sound and proper investigations. The Daily Oklahoman and the Tulsa World have published nine separate editorials viciously attacking me, Glenn Wilburn and all those who have stood up and demanded all of the truth about this terrible crime.

An editorial from the Daily Oklahoman entitled, "DROP IT, MR. KEY even had the audacity to say;

"As we argued when Key first set out on this course, the Legislature and its staff had no business investigating the bombing. It was, and is, poorly equipped to do so. The same can be said of a panel of local citizens" . . .

The same day Oklahoma Attorney General Drew Edmondson issued a personal attack saying that I was proposing a "wasteful witch hunt" and was pushing "the worst kind of paranoid conspiracy pandering"

People in powerful positions have repeatedly attacked those of us who have been scrutinizing the federal investigation. Oklahoma Governor Frank Keating was a former FBI agent himself and spent most of his career in the services of Federal Departments of the Treasury, Justice and HUD (Housing and Urban Development). At one time in his career his responsibilities included the overseeing of the ATF and other federal law enforcement. Gov. Keating went so far as to say that "raising questions would not bring one whit of intelligence to the process." He later escalated his attacks saying those of us who were raising serious questions were "howling at the moon" and "off the reservation."

3

All of these people are literally robbing the victims family members and survivors -- and all of us -- the opportunity and right to know the truth.

For nearly two years the negative media coverage seemed unending. And although I never vowed not to do any fundraising, going hat in hand was about the last thing I wanted to do. After all, I wasn't searching for cash, I was searching for answers. I shudder to think what sort of creative headlines would have appeared had I operated an active fundraising campaign in the wake of that tragedy.

In retrospect, I now believe I may have done a disservice by not fundraising.

First, had I acquired cash reserves for the very worthy cause I was working on, it would have aided tremendously in fighting the formidable disinformation and smear campaign waged by "faceless forces" that appear to have pockets of unending depth and the mass media at their beck and call.

Second, had I done fundraising, my own family and others wouldn't have gone into debt by this largely self-funded effort.

WE NOW FACE OUR GREATEST CHALLENGE

Glenn Wilburn, who lost two grand children in the tragedy, and I filed a petition in November, 1995, to have a local county grand jury impaneled to investigate the bombing. This independent grand jury would be fully autonomous of the federal investigation, and would double in the capacity of a watchdog of the federal investigation.

Here in Oklahoma, we are very fortunate to be one of only two states that have a constitutional guarantee that the people of a county can cause a grand jury to be impaneled whenever they feel there is a need simply by circulating a petition. It is and always has been a common occurrence in our state. In fact there are county grand juries meeting as I write this letter.

The Presiding State District Judge, Dan Owens, tried to stop us from petitioning to impanel the grand jury and we were forced to appeal his actions to a higher court. That is where the latest and some of the most intense criticism has come from recently. One year after our appeal, we finally got a written opinion from the Court of Appeals in the Tulsa district. On December 24, 1996 the court ruled not only in our favor, but they did so unanimously.

But wait--there is more. Not only was it unanimous, but the court issued the decision "For Publication." That means that it was such a clear-cut case in regard to the state constitution, statutes, and previous case law, that it constituted a precedent-setting case to be used in lawbooks, most likely for many years to come.

Yet, why is there such extreme opposition to keep this independent grand jury from being allowed to assemble? I believe the answer is because some in our federal law

4

enforcement agencies (i.e. ATF and FBI) had prior knowledge that certain individuals were planning to bomb the Murrah Federal Building! I believe that because of at least four reasons:

1) Six different individuals have come forward and reported seeing the bomb squad in the immediate vicinity of the Murrah Building early on the morning of the bombing.

2) The Oklahoma City Fire Department received a call from the FBI the Friday before the bombing and was told to be on the alert for a possible terrorist attack on a government building.

3) Bruce Shaw, who had frantically come to look for his wife inside the smoldering building, was told by an ATF agent, "You won't find any ATF agents in the building because they were warned on their pagers not to come in this morning and they're now in a debriefing." This conversation was corroborated by his boss who accompanied Bruce to help him find his wife.

4) Carol Howe, a paid informant for the ATF has recently come forward to confirm that she informed the ATF that two individuals, Dennis Mahon and Andreas Strassmier, were planning to bomb the federal building in Oklahoma City. She also said that the likely date for the bombing was April 19!

Prior knowledge on the part of some individuals in the federal government may also be why the federal prosecutors barred every single witness to John Doe(s) from the Federal Grand Jury. Of the more than 20 witnesses to one or more John Doe(s), none - not even one - were allowed to tell the Grand Jury what they saw. Additionally, when the prosecution's list of witnesses was unsealed several weeks ago, we found that the one witness who will be allowed to testify in the trial to McVeigh being in the company of a John Doe can't describe in any way who he saw. Indeed, the best witnesses who can positively place McVeigh in downtown Oklahoma City that morning saw him with one or more individuals and are able to describe to some degree what that person or persons looked like. Those witnesses will not be allowed to testify at McVeigh's trial.

Incredible? Did you hear that right? Yes, you did. As bizarre as it sounds, Federal Prosecutors were not allowing any of those witnesses to be seen or heard by the Federal Grand Jury. This gives "blind justice" a whole new meaning.

To make this even more clear, the Federal Grand Jury wanted to interview both the eye witnesses and the sketch artist who drew the John Doe composites but they were flatly refused by the federal "authorities." Clearly they were blatantly deprived of their basic Constitutional rights as grand jurors. Why?

Just what is it that they are trying to accomplish? Or, perhaps more pointedly, just who are they trying to protect? And what all are they trying to hide?

5

Let's not forget, elected officials are supposed to be the servants of the people and not the other way around. Just what's going on??? And how are they getting away with it?!!!!

Our efforts to impanel a county grand jury are important for numerous reasons. One of the reasons that concerns me most is that I fear that the record of McVeigh's trial will comprise the "official story" of what happened. If the evidence of prior knowledge and other perpetrators is not presented in this case, I fear that the government will be successful in shaping the official story to permanently exclude that evidence.

The 1993 New York World Trade Center bombing is a case in point.

Because certain tapes implicating the role of the FBI in allowing the attack to take place were ruled inadmissible in court, many people do not know that the FBI indeed had knowledge prior to that bombing and could have prevented it--yet they

allowed the plot to continue resulting in the deaths of six innocent people.

Unfortunately the transcripts of that court case have become the "official story" of what happened in that bombing.

Another reason that I feel that the OKC bombing case is important and directly effects you is that the government has gone to a new level of operating out of the bounds of the law and is becoming more and more arrogant.

A few weeks ago, ABC was getting ready to run a major story on the prior knowledge issue. The Justice Department became aware of it and contacted some of the executives at ABC. After acknowledging the validity of the story they put extreme pressure on ABC not to air the report saying, "The people couldn't handle the truth."

I don't know about you but that kind of arrogance sickens me and leaves me with a eerie feeling. The government must not be allowed to get away with yet another botched job! The Government must be held accountable.

The good news...

In spite of the seemingly impenetratable and insurmountable forces acting against us, on February 18, 1997 the Oklahoma State Supreme Court miraculously ruled in favor of allowing the independent local county grand jury and against the Federal Government's attempt to quash the rights of the people.

Now the forgotten families, survivors, and victims who died from the blast will have their right to a County Grand Jury and a full, open and truthful investigation.

6

The bad news...

Any day now the courts will give us the formalized written order to begin passing the petitions to impanel the independent jury, but we're just about stone broke.

For nearly two years, I never conducted so much as a single fluid-raiser to properly investigate this worst terrorist act in the history of both our state and the nation. I also know how tapped most people are these days, but I believe at this point, I don't have much of a choice.

We now need funds to secure copies of voluminous government documents, and to pay independent investigators, as well as money to print, publicize and distribute signature forms to complete the legal requirements to impanel the County Grand Jury. In short, this effort is now bigger than what I can handle fiscally or physically. May I count on your help?

Enclosed is a simple straight forward form asking for whatever financial assistance you can afford to give. Please do what you can. We will put you on our mailing list to keep you up to date on the petition drive and signature gathering process.

The clock is about to begin and we have limited time by law to gather signatures. And you know that the big players within the Federal Government are not likely to help us. That is why I

am counting on you.

Thank you for being patient and open-minded enough to read this letter. Together we can get the truth out, make a real difference and God willing, see justice prevail. May I please count on your help?

Sincerely,

Rep. Charles Key

P.S. Elements within the federal government and in the establishment media have done virtually everything in their power to block an independent county investigation of the Oklahoma bombing tragedy. On February 18 the Oklahoma Supreme Court cleared the way for the people to investigate the Federal Government and their investigation of the bombing. Next week we must begin obtaining signatures.

Will you please stand up and be counted? PLEASE FILL OUT THE ENCLOSED REPLY CARD AND SEND IT BACK TO ME RIGHT AWAY. It only takes a few moments, and it will make a real difference in the effort to uncover the truth about the Oklahoma bombing.


Thank you for your time and concern.

7

Address on envelope:

Oklahoma County Grand Jury &
Bombing Investigation Fund
Post Office Box 75669
Oklahoma City, OK 73147

This letter uploaded on March 23, 1997. .

.

Back to [News from the USSA Front](#) or
[Index?](#)
.

Dangerous Liasions

In May 1996 I went with some fellow Missourians to Gadsden, Alabama for a militia rally called the Good 'Ol Boys Roundup. Members from the Gadsden Minutemen had finished a BATF roundup of the same name a year earlier, once a videotape was released showing racist and lawless behavior of government policemen. So this rally was also in the nature of gloating over gubbnmintgunoons being caught in the act of being themselves.

It was an excellent militia gathering. People who I had formerly known only by means of e-mail I met in person and vice-versa. They are good people who will find themselves having to do hard things in the future, if they are to hold true to their vision of freedom and justice under a government limited by law.

This meeting was held at Jeff Randall's farm. Mr. Randall is no longer in the militia movement.

Among the questions and observations made by Mr. Randall when us Missourians left for home was: "Quite a few Christian Identity at the rally, wasn't there?" I said that I estimated about one-third of the attendees were Christian Identity, but such is the composition of our movement.

The militia movement has changed a good deal in the past ten months. With the disappearance of so many weak sisters shrinking from under the hammer wielded by a morally decaying but militarily strong police state, it is time for the militia movement to come out of hiding in the closet and provisionally recognize reality. Time to show awareness, if not appreciation, for shock troops who have in their fanaticism inoculation from the ills which have decayed much of the open militia movement. Time to recognize our weaknesses and to capitalize on the strengths of allies when facing a common enemy -- a decaying government out to destroy us all.

The Rise of the White Nationalist Movement.

What we, in our misguided posturing of moral superiority label "racists," are really distinguishable elements in a loose religious-political confederation of white (and, in some cases, black) people wanting to separate themselves from what they view as an evil majority out to destroy them, and in turn found a new country wherein they shall be the ruling majority.

Think that this is objectionable, even anti-American? Really? Remember the Pilgrims at Plymouth, the Quakers in Pennsylvania, the Mormons of Salt Lake City? All these "patriots" in their time were persecuted by the political authorities and the masses were indoctrinated to despise these religious-political movements of their day.

As there are less places deemed undesirable enough in which to dump these "cultists," the development of militancy as a means of self-defense escalates. The Mormons founded their own army to defend Utah, a far more inhospitable place than Pennsylvania was for the pacifistic Quakers. Today the Church of Scientology fights the IRS and uses government courts to ruin their enemies. The Branch Davidians never developed a suitable defense force or the will to use it, so as a result they were butchered and barbequed at will by federal police forces. Unless a separate people is confident enough to test the efficacy of their religious beliefs in the next world right away, they must develop a military 'action' arm to protect themselves quickly.

Origins of Christian Identity.

Such is definitely the case of the Christian Identity religion. In large part it is a fighting faith, in life-or-death opposition to what is deemed the Anti-Christ government of mankind, ruled over by Satan. Like the fedayeen of Islam, they are fighting a holy war.

The best known of these Christian Identity groups is the Aryan Nations. The name alone implies that they are of non-Semitic descent and of more than one nation. Ten "lost" tribes, say . . . -- of Israel? Their other, non-political name, is The Church of Jesus Christ, Christian. Christ, in their doxology, was not a Jew, or at least not a Jew in

the present racial sense. The CSA, or the Covenant, Arm and Sword of the Lord, was an even more militant faction of the Christian Identity religion, until it was broken over ten years ago by the ruling political regime. This fundamental religion has been engaged in warfare against the secular religion of power politics for over a decade, much like Iraqi Shi'ites and Kurds combating Saddam Hussein's socialistic Ba'ath Party regime.

It has been estimated that there are over three million believers in the Christian Identity faith. Most of them are overtly harmless to the interests of the ruling regime. But the ruling regime, based as it is on nothing more than the worship of state power will always see people they do not control absolutely as a threat. Hence the eventual butchery of the Branch Davidians, which was a minor sect of Seventh Day Adventism many times removed from militant Christian Identity.

The mainline teacher of Christian Identity was Herbert Armstrong's Worldwide Church of God and its numerous offshoots. An article of faith in the WWCG was that the present American nation was descended from the lost Israelite tribe called Manasseh, with the British being its brother tribe of Ephraim. The other European tribes are the other lost ten tribes, with the exception of Germany, who are the Assyrians, the people responsible for deporting the tribes of Israel from Israel -- much like the Soviet Union and U.S. did with its implacable indigenes. Hence the "Identity" behind Christian Identity.

The offshoots of the WWCG still preach about the "keys to understanding biblical prophecy," although they are understandably nervous about being tagged by a corrupt government as being "Christian Identity" and thus fair game with an open season for incineration. They no longer stress the matter as much. Since they believe that the Anti-Christ power is a resurrected Assyrian "Beast" in tandem with a Roman Catholic "Great Whore of Babylon," the WWCG and its offshoots are not a religious threat to the current American regime. The decay of the U.S. government and what is perceived as the resurgence of Germany is a cause for alarm and regret -- not exultation with these peaceful folk.

But Herbert Armstrong wasn't the first or only teacher of "British Israelitism." Much of current Christian Identity beliefs are based upon the modern Israelites (Germans included) being Aryans, like the Medes and Persians, not Semites (descended from Shem, Noah's son). Modern-day Jews are descended from the Khazars. All the other races are mud people, descended either from Cain, or the foul couplings between Satan, Lilith, and Adam, etc., etc., and other unbiblical teachings adapted to suit the prejudices of the moment. Hence militant "racism" left over from the 1960's fight against integration has grown a deep religious taproot.

The Growth of Christian Identity and White Nationalism.

We live in a time of flux, where change is regarded as being for the worse. Materialism has been measured in the scales and found wanting. Power politics, a religion for the secular materialists, is increasingly limited in the amount it can reward its followers, and is becoming a mere struggle for survival. Hence people try to find **something** to fasten their insecure lives around -- like fundamentalist religion. Around the world, authoritarian fundamentalist religion promises a secure haven from chaotic change, a guaranteed reward for regimented behavior.

The Iranians found this with Ayatollah Khomeine. But for every fundamentalist religion which succeeds absolutely, and then imposes heavy rule, there are many cults not strong enough to overturn the established social order. Some fundamentalist sects are utterly destroyed by the nervous state regime, like the Branch Davidians were at Waco. Some give up their struggle without a fight, like the San Diego UFO cult. Some, like Christian Identity, are much too strong to be utterly exterminated, but not strong enough to overthrow the state regime -- yet. So a skirmish line is set up between the militants and the decaying regime. From time to time there is conflict, as the boundaries are re-tested. This is what is happening **right now!** Do you know which side you should be on?

Sampling the Internet, it is sobering to observe the explosion of White Nationalist, Racist, Skinhead, and Christian Identity WWW sites. Recently observed was a "Southron" site, which opined that "[White] Southerners were a distinct race!" The liberal white or Jewish sites dedicated to "fighting hate" on the Net can't

update their listings of hate sites fast enough to please all the racists or Holocaust Revisionists who want such billing. In fact, if you wish to observe such pages, go to the "hatewatch" sites, which perform the service of selecting the ones deemed most "dangerous."

Ignored as "pathetic feebs" are such organizations as the assorted KuKluxKlan(s). Like your father's Oldsmobile, unsuccessful racism is regarded as passé by the younger set.

It is especially interesting to observe the people who are attracted to these sites -- upper-middle to lower-middle class young people. While daddy and mummy were 60's flower-children and hippies, their children and grandchildren are Skinheads and BootGrrrrrs! The kiddies know full well who is going to be stuck with the tab for Social Security and a decaying social order -- and they are pissed. Since they can't very well liquidate mummy & daddy for the way they screwed up the world, white teens have no alternative than to blame "niggers, wiggers, Jewz, spics & chinks" for their future unappetizing prospects. They may not know how to use proper grammar on the Web site's guestbook, but they sure are looking to kick some butt -- or so they say.

So what does this have to do with the militia movement, you may ask? It is relevant because this is where the future militias will find their troop strengths. Violence is a young man's game. Once a man gets over 35, he is usually content to let younger men hose down the local po-leece station with AK fire. The coming revolution will be fought by the GenXers and generated by the last wave of the baby boomers. Every revolution is fought most fiercely by those who have nothing to lose, maddened by the injustice of never being able to get ahead or find security through their own efforts.

Why the Resistance should *Recognize* its Natural Allies.

1. As mentioned above, the number one reason to provisionally recognize Christian Identity, White Nationalist, and Skinhead militias and personnel is because of their numbers *and their aggressiveness*. When one-third to forty percent of your troops hold such beliefs, overt or covert, trying to form a politically correct militia is pure foolishness.

Some of these people are uncomfortable to deal with sometimes. Many of them are fanatics. Most of them are not socially acceptable whatsoever. Such people should not be allowed to hold positions in the public eye when they are serving in the "constitutional" militias. They have definite drawbacks when dealing with a general public of dumbed-down drones. Their fanaticism, their uncompromising stances, their intractable militancy, can be public relations nightmares in the offing.

But enough of their weaknesses. Their corresponding *strengths* are their determination, their dedication, their indomitable resolution to see things through until the current regime lies like a dead dragon at their feet.

Looking at their WWW sites, one is struck by how they seem to be the only people with a vision for the future. They are not trying to sell you something. They are not trying to gratify their egos. They are not anarchists. They do not care whether you like them or not. They know their own minds. They will do whatever it takes, pay any price, to gain their own freedom under their own laws. They believe in two eyes for an eye, all your teeth for a tooth, so it is best not to trifle with them. Kill them outright or leave them be -- future lessons to be taught in blood which the present anarcho-fascist government will not survive long enough to learn.

2. Human nature dictates that we do not respect those who do not respect us. If "constitutional" militias do not recognize the CI, White Nationalist, and Skinhead militias, then we in turn will not only not be recognized by them, but held in contempt. This means that the current militia and patriot organizations will have *absolutely no* leverage, control, or input *whatsoever* with these other organizations.

So isn't that wonderful? Only if you believe that ignorance is bliss.

What if these other organizations get control over biological-warfare agents, nuclear weapons, or other weapons of mass destruction? Would it not be a good idea to have some influence over their deployment -- if for no other reason than to make sure your assets are not in the area of impact?

Carrying forth this policy carries with it great moral responsibilities. If you have no influence with the radicals, then you will not be able to mitigate or deny their actions. Oklahoma City might be remembered as a mere first firecracker heralding the next Fourth of July -- which you bore some responsibility for by your mere silence.

No longer can it be understood that telling a militia member something is the same as telling the FBI. A "Colonel" John Parsons bragged of doing exactly that in Kansas City in November 1995 to a splinter group of militia people. Parson's biggest beef? That the national news media didn't give him enough credit for his betrayal of a confidence! Few people should have been surprised by the later announcement that Parsons and his Tri-States Militia were funded by the FBI. The hard-line Christian Identity 'militias' only lost the 'services' of a crazed 'prophet of God' named Willie Lampley, who had the notion he had the resources to bomb the Southern Professional Liar's Center and three or four other government buildings *on the very same day*.

The CI "militias" only lost a lunatic who would have cost them casualties further down the line. Cooperation with 'constitutional militias' was given a setback. The FBI managed to highlight the need for leaderless resistance and cellular security among the enemies of the gubbnmint.

Without an understanding of some sort between the public militias and the underground resistance then Oklahoma City incidents will be commonplace and more expensive. More and more will be seen unholy conspiratorial alliances between oswalds like Timothy McVeigh; supplied with money and technology by foreign or domestic powers while at the same time the government, well aware of what is going on due to swarms of infiltrators, is setting off demolition charges on the inside columns after the truck bomb blast signals the go-ahead. McVeigh is a bungler, a Manchurian Candidate pushed around as a pawn by shadowy organizations wanting to herald "domestic" terrorism. What will the future bring when competent underground militants get real funding and instruction, with no guidance or control from anyone on our side?

Ignorance is not bliss. What we don't know will kill us. While in the initial stages of guerrilla warfare there is unrelated raiding and random violence carried out by individual cells, every successful guerrilla organization lays down conditions to where it is the former regime which must pack its bags and flee for their lives from the wrath of a victorious Resistance. Successful revolution requires discipline. We must take precautions to where it is only the agents of the ancién regime which lose all. We cannot afford to let the fabric of our civilization fray to the point to where restoration of law and order is impossible. Therefore, in some fashion or another, we *must* develop some means of command and control over *all* of our allies.

3. The common enemy is a despotic regime which values only power, treats us all like cattle to be used for the gain for the noble elites, and ignores with impunity the foundation law by which they derived their power. Such a lawless regime will judge, and in turn must be judged by the severity by which they judged others.

Right now, the law favors the criminals and the consumers of the fruits of other men's brow. In later times, it might even be looked back as a "golden age," as a "Disneyland for Dummies" for the great mass of people who learned the fine art of voting themselves bread and circuses. So until the edifice erected upon the printing press, government spending, and confiscatory taxation upon the productive collapses, any attempt to bring a revolution on behalf of the productive and the new elites will be looked upon with disfavor by those fattened at the public trough. There are doubtless laws against fomenting revolution, just as there are laws against suicide.

When there is collusion between criminals of the top and bottom waging war on the middle, why waste tears when thieves fall out squabbling over the loot?

Several weeks ago, two specimens from the growing underclass of losers this system breeds like maggots used fully automatic assault rifles and body armor to rob a bank. Strolling along beside the "getaway car" at speeds of up to two miles per hour, one saw them out-gunning the police, eight of whom got wounded before the unlicensed criminals were dispatched. Now the police claim to need more firepower. By all means, further arm the fascist morons! No telling where heavy weapons projectiles will land in built-up urban areas. Maybe the bullets will mushroom in white suburban areas and we will then hear different squawks from the white-chicken contingent. The cops might need their new heavy weaponry for their occasional expeditionary force into south-

central LA. No non-native policeman or CIA agent will dare venture forth in those areas to sell crack to the indigenes then.

And as far as Aryan Revolutionary Army cells robbing banks in the Midwest, well, so what? I know a number of banks in my area which cheated the poor and powerless every chance they get. I tell people not to sign a mortgage with certain banks because they have a sorry history of loaning money out, then foreclosing if a single payment is missed. One bank (Community Bank & Trust of Neosho, Missouri) stole \$50 from a friend who had put it into his passbook savings account under color of a new rule regarding the number of withdrawals per quarter. They deliberately waited until he had deposited \$55 into his account before invoking the new rule. I only got cheated out of \$3.50 myself before I pulled my account.

The banks are snitches for the IRS. The Cornhole Bank and Trust levied 31% unilateral IRS backup withholding on my \$5 non-interest bearing checking account gleefully. So any of you Aryan Republican Army cells or Dillinger clones out there: spare the Neosho Savings & Loan, which, while it "must" steal 14 cents per quarter on my \$40 passbook account to give to the gubbnmint revenooers, had at least the decency to call me up to advise me to pull my account several years ago.

Why protect the banks with your support? They have financed a lot of tyranny in return for a monopoly on usury. They are the mechanism of how government puts into circulation its bogus currency. Any money a bank robber steals is replaced by the federal reserve. The banks are on the side of their master and servant -- the government.

The court system is an open sewer whose only purpose is to make the lawyer class rich and powerful and to give life-and-death enforcement powers to a cowardly rabble of moronic psychotics known as policemen. The laws and constitution have been "interpreted" to mean whatever the judges and prosecutors say it means. The judge himself acts as an extension of the prosecution in every trial I have ever observed or been an a defendant in. If you are not a lawyer or officer of the government court, then every time you enter the bar area either your life, liberty or property is in peril as a defendant or you are treated like enemy chattel when a witness.

Having undermined the moral foundations of their pretend courts, what right do they have to our allegiance? By making criminal any matter wherein there is no true victim whose life, liberty, or property was affected, the government has politicized the court system, perverting and suborning it to serve its own desires. Having destroyed constitutional protections to better serve their greed, the government has no moral protection from a post-revolutionary majority passing new laws to make judges, lawyers, politicians and policemen the new criminal classes and encompassing their extermination. Having set into motion lawless precedent, they have no claim to neutral justice.

Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn wrote in *"The Gulag Archipelago"* that the concentration camp system was safe as long as the inmates believed that they, as individuals, were the only ones who were innocent, but that the system was shaken to its very roots once the inmates figured out that in all likelihood it was the state which was criminal.

As long as we believe we are "better" than some other patriot, and that "the government" must be protected from the likes of other, false patriots, then the strategy of divide and rule will pay dividends for our common enemy -- the government. Let us first unite in destroying the common enemy before worrying about whether or not we must get up before ten o'clock to worship on Saturday or Sunday. Having together destroyed the common tyranny, it is doubtful that anyone will desire nor dare impose a new one upon an awakened Resistance.

4. "But if we are nice to the Christian Identity, White Nationalists, Black Nationalists, Skinheads or other racist groups then people will think we are just like them!" I can already hear the foolishness from the malicious "generals" and "colonels" of the militia squads now.

Malcolm X, in his *"Autobiography"* told of how he would deal with the establishment integrationist Uncle Toms that plagued his Black Muslim movement. First he would ask the degreed pet token "house nigger" if he knew what the white man called the degreed negro. The middle-class black 'intellectual' would usually fall for the trap and say, "No, . . . what?" Then Malcolm X would spring the trap and rub in the answer: "Nigger!"

Morris Sleeze and the rest of the gubbnmint-lovers are already calling the Resistance movement racist inspired. The Gadsden Minutemen set Morris Sleeze up by giving Morris the chance to denounce racist ATF and other policemen for their conduct at their Good 'Ol Boys Roundup, but Morris and the rest of the for-profit civil rights rascals refused. They will not reward our foolishness in casting out our fellow fighting men with false praise. They have a collection plate they pass over and over again for guilt-ridden leftists to fill.

There is no political or military advantage to be gained by casting off our natural allies in return for a temporary pat on the back by politically correct idiots or calculating criminals. Any organism which cannot recognize a friend will not be able to reproduce itself. Any organism which mistakes an enemy for a friend is usually eaten or destroyed. The patriot movement better become at least as smart as a sheep in its abilities to recognize that yon skulking coyote is probably up to no good.

5. In recent months it has been observed that outlying resistance organizations such as the Republic of Texas and some of the common-law court people have been deemed by the very people who yammered "No more Wacos!" as now 'outside' the protection of 'The Constitution' and therefore 'Constitutional militias.'

This, of course, is cowardly appeasement. It is in effect the same as handing over our own for sacrifice to the state-god. I have already said some harsh words in previous issues concerning worshipping the false paper-god known as the Con-stitution. Now this oft-dishonored scrap of paper is to be used as a shield to cover the cowardly practice raised to a fine art of pissing down one's leg, throwing somebody to the wolves, and running for the tall grass.

Not here. Not ever.

Every goofy religious fanatic bulletted, bombed, or barbequed by gubbnmintgungeons is my co-religionist. Every old couple driven from their home by excessive taxation or government corruption is my father and mother. Every political prisoner jailed is my fellow inmate. Every revolutionary, regardless of faith, color or creed, who fights for freedom beside me is my brother. If I fall, they will avenge me. If they fall, I shall avenge them. Such is the Code of the Resistance.

Isn't it the shits that it is the very same people who have a militant value system or ideology to guide them, such as Christian Identity or White Nationalism, who have been far more resistant to turning over their own to 'government justice' than the secular political movement? It has been 'Libertarians' and 'constitutional militias' who have had a sorry history of back-biting, name-calling, egomaniacal hissy-fits, PX ribbon promotions, and betrayal. It is the unjustly despised and politically incorrect CI and White Nationalists who have been steadily keeping their faith in the yellowed teeth of our scorn. They have not yet answered our hypocrisy with the contempt it deserves.

Summary: It is time to recognize reality. It is time to recognize our allies in the struggle ahead.

by Martin Lindstedt,
Managing Editor, *Modern Militiaman*

.

.

Back to [The Patriot Coalition?](#)

Back to [Patrick Henry On-Line](#)

.

Return Fire!

Letters to the Editor

.

>

>>Return-path:
>>Date: Thu, 27 Mar 1997 13:02:17 -0800
>>From: [Frank Brady](#)
>>Subject: Re: Lead Editorial, Modern Militiaman, Issue #5.
>>To: Patricia Neill
>>Reply-to: bradyco@sky.NET
>>Organization: Brady & Associates

*An Organization of Lawyers or other deep-bottom trough feeders
of some kind or another.*

>>References: <199703241432.JAA21825@galileo.cc.rochester.edu>
>>
>>Patricia Neill wrote:

No, [Editor Lindstedt](#) wrote:

>>>

>>> The State of the Militia, April 19, 1997

>>SNIP

>>> While many of the open militias have degenerated into groups
>>> of "militia generals" commanding "units" of 4-5 lesser
>>> officers, yammering about the need to "restore" a piece of
>>> paper called "The Constitution," in the meantime modern
>>> militia units have, like icebergs, reacted to the heat by
>>> shielding well over nine-tenths of their bulk under the
>>> waterline.

>>SNIP

>>> Any militia falsely founded upon a piece of paper over 200
>>> years old, which all pay lip service to but nobody obeys
>>> called "The Constitution," deserves sacrifice to the State-
>>> god upon their false altar. Rather, it is to be understood
>>> that a steadfast application to the personal liberty of
>>> yourselves and your friends, while taking full advantage of
>>> any opportunities to defeat the enemy (gubbnmint, NWO, ZOG,
>>> city hall) is the hallmark of a successful Resistance
>>> organization.

>>--Martin Lindstedt,

>>> Managing Editor of "The Modern Militiaman"

>>

>>And with these words, Mr. Lindstedt stands revealed as a Jacobin
>>terrorist, a man who tells us that we rise up for nothing more
>>noble than "the personal liberty of yourself and your friends."
>>What a uniquely self-centered and hedonistic revolution he is
>>urging. And upon what transcendental principles will his brave
>>new world be based? Why on whatever pleases him (and his friends)
>>at the moment, apparently.

>>

>>The Constitution, Mr. Lindstedt, is more than "a piece of paper."
>>It is among the cornerstone documents of Western Civilization,
>>that through which a people established the moral and legal basis
>>for government and defined the rights of man. That it has been
>>sullied and assaulted is beyond question--but one doubts that your

>>writings will improve upon it as a basis for self-government.

>>

>>Frank Brady

>>

Usually I divide the Constitutional idolaters into two camps: idiots and/or criminals. Due to Mr. Brady's skillful rationalizations and affiliation with what sounds like a law firm, I can in good faith assume the latter.

Throughout the ages, cowardly criminals have erected false gods and doxologies in order to steal without fear of quick retaliation. If they were honest thieves, and got caught stealing freelance, they might be quickly killed by their "victims." Hence, after forming a thieves guild, it becomes necessary to pacify the would-be victims into thinking that their victimization is the natural order of things -- even 'legal'.

In modern times, the false god is gubbnmint, and its current doxology is "The Constitution."

Now we live in a end time when everyone has been thoroughly looted by Brady & Associates, and other sundry thieves and there isn't much left to steal. While I would normally have no problem with watching the last thief cannibalize the last fool, this is an imperfect world. I might not be left alone while nature takes its course. Hence, I must be armed and ready so as to be left in peace while the end result prevails: the last of the food animals are devoured by the predators, and then, in the interests of safety & hygiene, eliminate the starving parasites and predators.

No, the sun will rise tomorrow out of the east, even if I do not sacrifice my oldest child to Molech, lay down on the altar atop a pyramid and let the blood-encrusted high priest tear out my heart, or bellow some onanism to "The Constitution."

Go out and munch on some herd animals, Mr. Brady. Your time will soon come.

--Martin Lindstedt,
Managing Editor, *Modern Militiaman*

.

Back to [Index](#)?

.

.

Back to [Modern Militiaman, Issue #5](#)

Back to [The Patriot Coalition](#)?

Back to [Patrick Henry On-Line](#)

.